

Construction of Capacity-Achieving Lattice Codes: Polar Lattices

Yanfei Yan, Ling Liu, Cong Ling, *Member, IEEE* and Xiaofu Wu *Member, IEEE*

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new class of lattices constructed from polar codes, namely polar lattices, to achieve the capacity $\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR})$ of the additive white Gaussian-noise (AWGN) channel for any signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Our construction follows the multilevel approach of Forney *et al.*, where on each level we construct a capacity-achieving polar code. The component polar codes are naturally nested, thereby fulfilling the requirement of the multilevel lattice construction. We prove that polar lattices are *AWGN-good*, in the sense that the error probability (for infinite lattice decoding) vanishes for any fixed volume-to-noise ratio (VNR) greater than $2\pi e$. Furthermore, using the technique of source polarization, we propose discrete Gaussian shaping over the polar lattice to satisfy the power constraint. The proposed polar lattices permit low-complexity multistage successive cancellation decoding. Both the construction and shaping are explicit, and the overall complexity of encoding and decoding is $O(N \log N)$ for any fixed target error probability.

Index Terms

AWGN-good lattices, discrete Gaussian shaping, lattice codes, multilevel construction, polar codes.

I. INTRODUCTION

A fast-decodable, structured code achieving the capacity of the power-constrained additive white Gaussian-noise (AWGN) channel is the dream goal of coding theory. Polar codes, proposed by Arikan in [1], can provably achieve the capacity of binary memoryless symmetric (BMS) channels. There are considerable efforts to extend polar codes to general discrete memoryless channels, to nonbinary polar codes, and to asymmetric channels [2]–[7]. A largely theoretic attempt to construct polar codes for the AWGN channel was given in [8], [9], based on nonbinary polar codes or on the technique for the multi-access channel. However, it is still an open problem to construct practical polar codes to achieve the capacity of the AWGN channel. In this paper, we propose polar lattices to fulfil this goal, based on a combination of binary polar codes and lattice codes.

This work was presented in part at the IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW) 2012, Laussane, Switzerland, September, 2012, and in part at the IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT), Istanbul, Turkey, July, 2013. The work of Yanfei Yan and Ling Liu is supported by the China Scholarship Council. The work of Xiaofu Wu is supported by the National Science Foundation of China.

Yanfei Yan, Ling Liu and Cong Ling are with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Imperial College London, London, UK (e-mails: y.yan10, l.liu12@imperial.ac.uk, cling@ieee.org).

Xiaofu Wu is with the Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Nanjing 210003, China (e-mail: xfwu@ieee.org).

Lattice codes are the counterpart of linear codes in the Euclidean space. The existence of lattice codes achieving the Gaussian channel capacity has been established using the random coding argument [10], [11]. Lattice codes are also useful in a wide range of applications in multiterminal communications, such as information-theoretic security [12], compute-and-forward [13], and distributed source coding [14] (see [15] for an overview). It is well known that the design of a lattice code consists of two essentially separate problems: AWGN coding and shaping. AWGN coding is addressed by the notion of AWGN-good lattices [10], [16]. Informally, AWGN-goodness means that if the fundamental volume of the lattice is slightly greater than that of the “noise sphere”, the error probability of infinite lattice decoding could be made arbitrarily small. Recently, several new lattice constructions with good performance have been introduced [17]–[20]. On the other hand, shaping takes care of the finite power constraint of the Gaussian channel. Capacity-achieving shaping techniques include Voronoi shaping [10] and lattice Gaussian shaping [11]. Despite these significant progresses, an explicit construction of lattice codes achieving the capacity of the Gaussian channel is still missing up until now.

A. Contributions

In this paper, we settle this open problem by employing the powerful tool of polarization in lattice construction. The novel technical contribution of this paper is two-fold:

- The construction of polar lattices and the proof of their AWGN-goodness. We follow the multilevel construction of Forney, Trott and Chung [21], where for each level we build a polar code to achieve its capacity. A salient feature of the proposed method is that it naturally leads to a set of nested polar codes, as required by the multilevel construction. This compares favorably with existing multilevel constructions [17], where extra efforts are needed to nest the component codes.
- The Gaussian shaping technique for polar lattices in the power-constrained AWGN channel. This is based on source polarization. We are able to achieve the capacity $\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR})$ with low-complexity multistage successive cancellation (SC) decoding for any given signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). It is worth mentioning that our proposed shaping scheme is not only a practical implementation of lattice Gaussian shaping, but also an improvement in the sense that we successfully remove the restriction $\text{SNR} > e$ in [11, Theorem 3].

Both source and channel polarization are employed in the construction, resulting in an integrated approach in the sense that error correction and shaping are performed by one single polar code on each level. Further, it is worth pointing out that each aspect may also be of independent interest. AWGN-good lattices have many applications in network information theory (e.g., the aforementioned compute-and-forward and Wyner-Ziv coding), while lattice Gaussian shaping, i.e., generating a Gaussian distribution over a lattice, is useful in lattice-based cryptography as well [22].

Both theoretic and practical aspects of polar lattices are addressed in this paper. We not only prove the theoretic goodness of polar lattices, but also give practical rules for designing these lattices.

B. Relation to Prior Works

This paper is built on the basis of our prior attempt to build lattices from polar codes [23], [24], and significantly extends it by employing Gaussian shaping. We are aware of the contemporary and independent work on polar-coded modulation [25], which follows the multilevel coding approach of [26]. It is known that Forney *et al.*'s multilevel construction is closely related to multilevel coding [21], [26]. The main conceptual difference between lattice coding and coded modulation is that lattices are infinite and linear in the Euclidean space. The linear structure of lattices is much desired in many emerging applications, e.g., in network information theory for the purpose of coordination [13], [14].

This paper may be viewed as an explicit construction of the lattice Gaussian coding scheme proposed in [11], where it was shown that Gaussian shaping over an AWGN-good lattice is capacity-achieving. Our approach is different from the standard Voronoi shaping which involves a quantization-good lattice [10]. The proposed Gaussian shaping does not require such a quantization-good lattice any more.

The sparse superposition code [27], [28] also achieves the Gaussian channel capacity with polynomial complexity. However, its decoding complexity is considerably higher than that of the polar lattice; moreover, it requires a random dictionary shared by the encoder and decoder, which incurs substantial storage complexity. In comparison, the construction of polar lattices is as explicit as that of polar codes themselves, and the complexity is quasilinear: $O(N \log^2 N)$ for a sub-exponentially vanishing error probability and $O(N \log N)$ for a fixed error probability, respectively.

C. Organization and Notation

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the background of lattice codes. In Section III, we construct polar lattices based on Forney *et al.*'s approach and prove their AWGN-goodness. In Section IV, we propose Gaussian shaping over the polar lattice to achieve the capacity. Section V gives design examples and simulation results.

All random variables (RVs) will be denoted by capital letters. Let P_X denote the probability distribution of a RV X taking values x in a set $\mathcal{X}$ and let $H(X)$ denote its entropy. For multilevel coding, we denote by X_ℓ a RV X at level ℓ . The i -th realization of X_ℓ is denoted by x_ℓ^i . We also use the notation $x_\ell^{i:j}$ as a shorthand for a vector $(x_\ell^i, \dots, x_\ell^j)$, which is a realization of RVs $X_\ell^{i:j} = (X_\ell^i, \dots, X_\ell^j)$. Similarly, $x_{\ell:j}^i$ will denote the realization of the i -th RV from level ℓ to level j , i.e., of $X_{\ell:j}^i = (X_\ell^i, \dots, X_j^i)$. For a set $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{I}^c$ denotes its complement, and $|\mathcal{I}|$ represents its cardinality. For an integer N , $[N]$ denotes the set of all integers from 1 to N . Following the notation of [1], we denote N independent uses of channel W by W^N . By channel combining and splitting, we get the combined channel W_N and the i -th subchannel $W_N^{(i)}$. $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function. Throughout this paper, we use the binary logarithm, denoted by $\log$, and information is measured in bits.

II. BACKGROUND ON LATTICE CODING

A. Definitions

A lattice is a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^n$ which can be described by

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda = Bx : x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\},$$

where the generator matrix B has full rank.

For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the nearest-neighbor quantizer associated with Λ is $Q_\Lambda(x) = \arg \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\lambda - x\|$. We define the modulo lattice operation by $x \bmod \Lambda \triangleq x - Q_\Lambda(x)$. The Voronoi region of Λ , defined by $\mathcal{V}(\Lambda) = \{x : Q_\Lambda(x) = 0\}$, specifies the nearest-neighbor decoding region. The Voronoi cell is one example of fundamental region of the lattice. A measurable set $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a fundamental region of the lattice Λ if $\cup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (\mathcal{R}(\Lambda) + \lambda) = \mathbb{R}^n$ and if $(\mathcal{R}(\Lambda) + \lambda) \cap (\mathcal{R}(\Lambda) + \lambda')$ has measure 0 for any $\lambda \neq \lambda'$ in Λ . The volume of a fundamental region is equal to that of the Voronoi region $\mathcal{V}(\Lambda)$, which is given by $V(\Lambda) = |\det(B)|$. More generally, the $\text{mod-}\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$ operation is defined by $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$ where $\tilde{x}$ is the unique element of $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$ such that $\tilde{x} - x \in \Lambda$. Obviously, the usual $\text{mod-}\Lambda$ operation corresponds to the case where $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{V}(\Lambda)$.

The theta series of Λ (see, e.g., [29, p.70]) is defined as

$$\Theta_\Lambda(\tau) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} e^{-\pi\tau\|\lambda\|^2}, \quad \tau > 0.$$

In this paper, we are mostly concerned with the block error probability $P_e(\Lambda, \sigma^2)$ of lattice decoding. It is the probability $\mathbb{P}\{x \notin \mathcal{V}(\Lambda)\}$ that an n -dimensional independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian noise vector x with zero mean and variance σ^2 per dimension falls outside the Voronoi region $\mathcal{V}(\Lambda)$. For an n -dimensional lattice Λ , define the VNR by

$$\gamma_\Lambda(\sigma) \triangleq \frac{V(\Lambda)^{\frac{2}{n}}}{\sigma^2}.$$

Then we introduce the notion of lattices which are good for the AWGN channel without power constraint.

Definition 1 (AWGN-good lattices): A sequence of lattices $\Lambda^{(n)}$ of increasing dimension n is AWGN-good if, for any fixed $P_e(\Lambda^{(n)}, \sigma^2) \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{\Lambda^{(n)}}(\sigma) = 2\pi e$$

and if, for a fixed VNR greater than $2\pi e$, $P_e(\Lambda^{(n)}, \sigma^2)$ goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It is worth mentioning here that we do not insist on exponentially vanishing error probabilities, unlike Poltyrev's original treatment of good lattices for coding over the AWGN channel [16]. This is because a sub-exponential or polynomial decay of the error probability is often good enough.

B. Flatness Factor and Lattice Gaussian Distribution

For $\sigma > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the Gaussian distribution of mean c and variance σ^2 is defined as

$$f_{\sigma,c}(x) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n} e^{-\frac{\|x-c\|^2}{2\sigma^2}},$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For convenience, let $f_\sigma(x) = f_{\sigma,0}(x)$.

Given lattice Λ , we define the Λ -periodic function

$$f_{\sigma,\Lambda}(x) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_{\sigma,\lambda}(x) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} e^{-\frac{\|x-\lambda\|^2}{2\sigma^2}},$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Note that $f_{\sigma,\Lambda}(x)$ is a probability density if x is restricted to a fundamental region $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$. It is actually the probability density function (PDF) of the Λ -aliased Gaussian noise, i.e., the Gaussian noise after the mod- $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$ operation [21]. When σ is small, the effect of aliasing becomes insignificant and the Λ -aliased Gaussian density $f_{\sigma,\Lambda}(x)$ approaches a Gaussian distribution. When σ is large, $f_{\sigma,\Lambda}(x)$ approaches a uniform distribution.

This phenomenon is characterized by the flatness factor, which is defined for a lattice Λ as [12]

$$\epsilon_\Lambda(\sigma) \triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{R}(\Lambda)} |V(\Lambda)f_{\sigma,\Lambda}(x) - 1|.$$

It can be interpreted as the maximum variation of $f_{\sigma,\Lambda}(x)$ from the uniform distribution over $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$. The flatness factor can be calculated using the theta series [12]:

$$\epsilon_\Lambda(\sigma) = \left(\frac{\gamma_\Lambda(\sigma)}{2\pi} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \Theta_\Lambda \left(\frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} \right) - 1.$$

We define the *discrete Gaussian distribution* over Λ centered at $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as the following discrete distribution taking values in $\lambda \in \Lambda$:

$$D_{\Lambda,\sigma,c}(\lambda) = \frac{f_{\sigma,c}(\lambda)}{f_{\sigma,c}(\Lambda)}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda,$$

where $f_{\sigma,c}(\Lambda) \triangleq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_{\sigma,c}(\lambda) = f_{\sigma,\Lambda}(c)$. Again for convenience, we write $D_{\Lambda,\sigma} = D_{\Lambda,\sigma,0}$. Fig. 1 illustrates the discrete Gaussian distribution over $\mathbb{Z}^2$. As can be seen, it resembles a continuous Gaussian distribution, but is only defined over a lattice. In fact, discrete and continuous Gaussian distributions share similar properties, if the flatness factor is small.

It will be useful to define the discrete Gaussian distribution over a coset of Λ , i.e., the shifted lattice $\Lambda - c$:

$$D_{\Lambda-c,\sigma}(\lambda - c) = \frac{f_{\sigma}(\lambda - c)}{f_{\sigma,c}(\Lambda)}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Note the relation $D_{\Lambda-c,\sigma}(\lambda - c) = D_{\Lambda,\sigma,c}(\lambda)$, namely, they are a shifted version of each other.

If the flatness factor is negligible, the discrete Gaussian distribution over a lattice preserves the capacity of the AWGN channel.

Theorem 1 (Mutual information of discrete Gaussian distribution [11]): Consider an AWGN channel $Y = X + E$ where the input constellation X has a discrete Gaussian distribution $D_{\Lambda-c,\sigma_s}$ for arbitrary $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and where the variance of the noise E is σ^2 . Let the average signal power be P so that $\text{SNR} = P/\sigma^2$, and let $\tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \frac{\sigma_s \sigma}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}}$. Then, if $\varepsilon = \epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}) < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{\pi \varepsilon_t}{1 - \varepsilon_t} \leq \varepsilon$ where

$$\varepsilon_t \triangleq \begin{cases} \epsilon_\Lambda \left(\sigma_s / \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\pi - t}} \right), & t \geq 1/e \\ (t^{-4} + 1) \epsilon_\Lambda \left(\sigma_s / \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\pi - t}} \right), & 0 < t < 1/e \end{cases}$$




Fig. 1. Discrete Gaussian distribution over $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

the discrete Gaussian constellation results in mutual information

$$I_D \geq \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR}) - \frac{5\varepsilon}{n} \quad (1)$$

per channel use.

The statement of Theorem 1 is non-asymptotical, i.e., it can hold even if $n = 1$. A lattice Λ or its coset $\Lambda - c$ with a discrete Gaussian distribution is referred to as a *good constellation* for the AWGN channel if $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})$ is negligible [11].

It is further proved in [11] that the channel capacity is achieved with Gaussian shaping over an AWGN-good lattice and MMSE lattice decoding. To this aim, we use a codebook $L - c$, where L is an AWGN-good lattice and c is a proper shift. The encoder maps the information bits to points in $L - c$, which obey the lattice Gaussian distribution D_{L-c, σ_s} . Since the lattice points are not equally probable a priori in the lattice Gaussian coding, we apply maximum-a-posteriori (MAP) decoding. It is proved in [11] that MAP decoding is equivalent to MMSE lattice decoding

$$\hat{x} = Q_{L-c}(\alpha y) \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha = \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}$ is asymptotically equal to the MMSE coefficient $\frac{P}{P + \sigma^2}$ and Q_{L-c} denotes the minimum Euclidean-distance decoder for shifted lattice $L - c$.

C. Construction D

A sublattice $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ induces a partition (denoted by Λ/Λ') of Λ into equivalence classes modulo Λ' . The order of the partition is denoted by $|\Lambda/\Lambda'|$, which is equal to the number of cosets. If $|\Lambda/\Lambda'| = 2$, we call this a binary partition. Let $\Lambda/\Lambda_1/\dots/\Lambda_{r-1}/\Lambda'$ for $r \geq 1$ be an n -dimensional lattice partition chain. For each partition $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq r$ with convention $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$ and $\Lambda_r = \Lambda'$) a code $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ over $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ selects a sequence of representatives a_ℓ for the cosets of Λ_ℓ . Consequently, if each partition is a binary partition, the codes $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ are binary codes.

Construction D requires a set of nested linear binary codes $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2 \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{C}_r$ [21]. Suppose $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ has block length N and the number of information bits k_ℓ for $1 \leq \ell \leq r$. Choose a basis $\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2, \dots, \mathbf{g}_N$ such that $\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{k_\ell}$ span $\mathcal{C}_\ell$. When $n = 1$, the lattice L admits the form [21]

$$L = \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^r 2^{\ell-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k_\ell} u_\ell^i \mathbf{g}_i + 2^r \mathbb{Z}^N \mid u_\ell^i \in \{0, 1\} \right\} \quad (3)$$

where the addition is carried out in $\mathbb{R}^N$. The fundamental volume of a lattice obtained from this construction is given by

$$V(L) = 2^{-NR_C} V(\Lambda')^N,$$

where $R_C = \sum_{\ell=1}^r R_\ell = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^r k_\ell$ denotes the sum rate of component codes. In this paper, we will use both the one-dimensional lattice partition chain $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}/\cdots/2^r\mathbb{Z}$ and the multi-dimensional lattice partition chain¹.

The following is an example of Construction D: Barnes-Wall lattices constructed from Reed-Muller codes [31]². Reed-Muller codes $\text{RM}(N, k, d)$ are a class of linear block codes over $\text{GF}(2)$, where N is the length of the codeword, k is the length of the information block and d is the minimum Hamming distance. Conventionally, Reed-Muller codes are denoted by $\text{RM}(r', m)$ ($0 \leq r' \leq m$) with following relation between N , k and d :

$$N = 2^m, k = 1 + \binom{m}{1} + \cdots + \binom{m}{r'}, d = 2^{m-r'}.$$

The m -th member of the family of Barnes-Wall lattices is a $N = 2^m$ dimensional complex lattice or $2N$ dimensional real lattice. For example, the code formula of the 1024-dimensional Barnes-Wall lattice is:

$$BW_{1024} = \text{RM}(1, 10) + 2\text{RM}(3, 10) + \cdots + 2^5 \mathbb{Z}^{1024}. \quad (4)$$

III. CONSTRUCTION OF POLAR LATTICES

As reviewed in the preceding section, achieving the channel capacity involves an AWGN-good lattice. Forney *et al.* gave single and multilevel constructions of AWGN-good lattices in [21]. We now follow their multilevel approach to construct polar lattices. In order to achieve the capacity of the AWGN channel with the noise variance σ^2 , the concerned noise variance for the AWGN-good lattice is $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ (recall $\tilde{\sigma} \triangleq \frac{\sigma_s \sigma}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}}$), which is the variance of the equivalent noise after MMSE rescaling [11]. This methodology can also be justified by the equivalence lemma in the next section (see Lemma 10).

¹The case of multi-dimensional lattice partition is also known as “Construction E”, for which the lattice L is of the dimension $n_L = nN$. In this paper, we refer to both one and multi-dimensional cases generally as Construction D. See also [29, Chap. 5] [30].

²We give the example of Barnes-Wall lattices as a benchmark particularly because of the connection between Reed-Muller codes and polar codes [1]. The advantage of polar codes over Reed-Muller codes will translate into the advantage of polar lattices over Barnes-Wall lattices.

A. Forney et al.'s Construction Revisited

A mod- Λ Gaussian channel is a Gaussian channel with an input in any fundamental region $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$ and with a mod- $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$ operator at the receiver front end [21]. The capacity of the mod- Λ channel for noise variance $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ is

$$C(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2) = \log V(\Lambda) - h(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2), \quad (5)$$

where $h(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$ is the differential entropy of the Λ -aliased noise over $\mathcal{V}(\Lambda)$:

$$h(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2) = - \int_{\mathcal{V}(\Lambda)} f_{\tilde{\sigma}, \Lambda}(x) \log f_{\tilde{\sigma}, \Lambda}(x) dx.$$

Given lattice partition Λ/Λ' , the Λ/Λ' channel is a mod- Λ' channel whose input is restricted to discrete lattice points in $(\Lambda + a) \cap \mathcal{R}(\Lambda')$ for some translate a . The capacity of the Λ/Λ' channel is given by [21]

$$\begin{aligned} C(\Lambda/\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) &= C(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) - C(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \\ &= h(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2) - h(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) + \log V(\Lambda')/V(\Lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Further, if $\Lambda/\Lambda_1/\dots/\Lambda_{r-1}/\Lambda'$ is a lattice partition chain, then

$$C(\Lambda/\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) = C(\Lambda/\Lambda_1, \tilde{\sigma}^2) + \dots + C(\Lambda_{r-1}/\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2). \quad (7)$$

The key idea of [21] is to use a good component code $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ to achieve the capacity $C(\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$ for each level $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, r$ in Construction D. For such a construction, the total decoding error probability with multistage decoding is bounded by

$$P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^r P_e(\mathcal{C}_\ell, \tilde{\sigma}^2) + P_e((\Lambda')^N, \tilde{\sigma}^2). \quad (8)$$

To make $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow 0$, we need to choose the lattice Λ' such that $P_e((\Lambda')^N, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow 0$ and the codes $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ for the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channels whose error probabilities also tend to zero.

Since $V(L) = 2^{-NR_C} V(\Lambda')^N$, the logarithmic VNR of L is

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) &= \log \frac{V(L)^{\frac{2}{nN}}}{2\pi e \tilde{\sigma}^2} \\ &= \log \frac{2^{-\frac{2}{n} R_C} V(\Lambda')^{\frac{2}{n}}}{2\pi e \tilde{\sigma}^2} \\ &= -\frac{2}{n} R_C + \frac{2}{n} \log V(\Lambda') - \log 2\pi e \tilde{\sigma}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Define

$$\begin{cases} \epsilon_1 = C(\Lambda_1, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \\ \epsilon_2 = h(\tilde{\sigma}^2) - h(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) \\ \epsilon_3 = C(\Lambda/\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) - R_C = \sum_{\ell=1}^r C(\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell, \tilde{\sigma}^2) - R_\ell, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $h(\tilde{\sigma}^2) = \frac{n}{2} \log 2\pi e \tilde{\sigma}^2$ is the differential entropy of the Gaussian noise. We note that, $\epsilon_1 \geq 0$ represents the capacity of the mod- Λ_1 channel, $\epsilon_2 \geq 0$ (due to the data processing theorem) is the difference between the entropy of the Gaussian noise and that of the mod- Λ_r Gaussian noise, and $\epsilon_3 \geq 0$ is the total capacity loss of component codes.

Then we have

$$\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) = \frac{2}{n}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3).$$

Since $\epsilon_2 \geq 0$, we obtain the upper bound³

$$\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) \leq \frac{2}{n}(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_3). \quad (11)$$

Since $\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) = 0$ represents the Poltyrev capacity, the right hand side of (11) gives an upper bound on the gap to the Poltyrev capacity. The bound is equal to $\frac{6.02}{n}(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_3)$ decibels (dB), by conversion of the binary logarithm into the base-10 logarithm.

To approach the Poltyrev capacity, we would like to have $\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) \rightarrow 0$ while $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow 0$. Thus, from (11), we need that both ϵ_1 and ϵ_3 are negligible. In Appendix A, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1: The capacity of the mod- Λ channel is bounded by

$$C(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \leq \log(1 + \epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})) \leq \log(e) \cdot \epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}). \quad (12)$$

Thus, we have the following design criteria:

- The top lattice Λ has a negligible flatness factor $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})$.
- The bottom lattice Λ' has a small error probability $P_e(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2)$.
- The component codes $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ are capacity-approaching codes for the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channels each.

These conditions are essentially the same as those of Forney et al. [21], except that we impose a slightly stronger condition on the top lattice. In [21], the top lattice satisfies $C(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \approx 0$. The reason why we require negligible $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})$ is to achieve the capacity of the power-constrained Gaussian channel. This will become clear in the next section.

Asymptotically, the error probability of polar codes decrease as $e^{-O(\sqrt{N})}$ and we may desire the same for the error probability of polar lattices. By (8), we want $P_e((\Lambda')^N, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$ to decrease exponentially. The next lemma shows that, for this to happen, r needs to grow with $\log N$. The proof is given in Appendix B.

Lemma 2: Consider a partition chain $\Lambda/\Lambda_1/\dots/\Lambda_{r-1}/\Lambda'$. In order that $P_e(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) = e^{-O(N)}$, it is necessary that the number of levels $r = O(\log N)$.

This lemma is mostly of theoretic interest. In practical designs, if the target error probability (e.g., $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) = 10^{-5}$) is fixed, a small number of levels will suffice.

B. Polar Lattices

It is shown in [21] that the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel is symmetric, and that the optimum input distribution is uniform. Since we use a binary partition $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$, the input X_ℓ is binary for $\ell \in 1, 2, \dots, r$. Associate X_ℓ with representative

³It was shown in [21] that $\epsilon_2 \approx \pi P_e(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2)$, which is negligible compared to the other two terms.

a_ℓ of the coset in the quotient group $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$. The fact that the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel is a BMS channel allows a polar code to achieve its capacity.

Let Y denote the output of the AWGN channel. Given $x_{1:\ell-1}$, let $\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})$ denote the coset chosen by x_ℓ , i.e., $\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell}) = a_1 + \dots + a_\ell + \Lambda_\ell$. Assuming a uniform input distribution for all X_ℓ , the conditional PDF of this $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel with input x_ℓ and output $\bar{y}_\ell = y \bmod \Lambda_\ell$ is given by [26, (5)]

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\bar{Y}_\ell|X_\ell, X_{1:\ell-1}}(\bar{y}_\ell|x_\ell, x_{1:\ell-1}) &= f_{\sigma, \Lambda_\ell}(\bar{y}_\ell - a_1 - \dots - a_\ell) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\bar{y}_\ell - a\|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In [21], this conditional PDF is written in a somewhat different form. Namely, the conditional PDF is $f_{\sigma, \Lambda_\ell}(\bar{y}_\ell - a - a_\ell)$ with an offset a . Nevertheless, the two forms are equivalent because we can let the offset $a = a_1 + \dots + a_{\ell-1}$. The regularity (symmetry) and capacity separability [21, Th. 4 and Th. 5] of the Λ/Λ' channel hold for any offset on its input. In fact, the offset due to previous input bits $x_{1:\ell-1}$ would be removed by the multistage decoder at level ℓ , which means that the code for level ℓ can be designed according to (13) with $x_{1:\ell-1} = 0$. For this reason, we will fix $x_{1:\ell-1} = 0$ to prove channel degradation in the following lemma. The reason why we use the form (13) is for consistency with the case of non-uniform input $x_{1:\ell-1}$ in Sect. IV, where one cannot always let $x_{1:\ell-1} = 0$.

Definition 2: (Degradation [32, Definition 1.7]): Consider two channels $W_1 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_1$ and $W_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$. W_1 is said to be (stochastically) degraded with respect to W_2 if there exists a distribution $Q : \mathcal{Y}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_1$ such that

$$W_1(y_1|x) = \sum_{y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}_2} W_2(y_2|x) Q(y_1|y_2).$$

The proof of the following lemma is given in Appendix C.

Lemma 3: Consider a self-similar binary lattice partition chain $\Lambda/\Lambda_1/\dots/\Lambda_{r-1}/\Lambda'$, in which we have $\Lambda_\ell = T^\ell \Lambda$ for all ℓ , with $T = \alpha V$ for some scale factor $\alpha > 1$ and orthogonal matrix V . Then, the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel is degraded with respect to the $\Lambda_\ell/\Lambda_{\ell+1}$ channel for $1 \leq \ell \leq r-1$.

Now, we recall some basics of polar codes. Let $\tilde{W}(y|x)$ be a BMS channel with input alphabet $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ and output alphabet $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Polar codes are block codes of length $N = 2^m$ with input bits $u^{1:N}$. Let $I(\tilde{W})$ be the capacity of $\tilde{W}$. Given the rate $R < I(\tilde{W})$, the information bits are indexed by a set of RN rows of the generator matrix $G_N = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes m}$, where $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product. This gives an N -dimensional channel $\tilde{W}_N(y^{1:N}|u^{1:N})$. The channel seen by each bit [1] is given by

$$\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}(y^{1:N}, u^{1:i-1}|u^i) = \sum_{u^{i+1:N} \in \mathcal{X}^{N-i}} \frac{1}{2^{N-1}} \tilde{W}_N(y^{1:N}|u^{1:N}).$$

Arkan proved that as N grows, $\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}$ approaches either an error-free channel or a completely noisy channel. The set of completely noisy (resp. error-free) subchannels is called the frozen set $\mathcal{F}$ (resp. information set $\mathcal{I}$). One sets $u^i = 0$ for $i \in \mathcal{F}$ and only sends information bits within $\mathcal{I}$.

The rule of SC decoding is defined as

$$\hat{u}^i = \begin{cases} 0 & i \in \mathcal{F} \text{ or } \frac{\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}(y^{1:N}, \hat{u}^{1:i-1}|0)}{\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}(y^{1:N}, \hat{u}^{1:i-1}|1)} \geq 1 \text{ when } i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 3 (Bhattacharyya Parameter for Symmetric Channel [1]): Given a BMS channel $\tilde{W}$ with transition probability $P_{Y|X}$, the Bhattacharyya parameter $\tilde{Z} \in [0, 1]$ is defined as

$$\tilde{Z}(\tilde{W}) \triangleq \sum_y \sqrt{P_{Y|X}(y|0)P_{Y|X}(y|1)}.$$

Let P_B denote the block error probability of a binary polar code. P_B can be upper-bounded as $P_B \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{Z}(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)})$.

It was shown in [32], [33] that for any $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \{i : Z(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}) < 2^{-N^\beta}\} \right| &= I(\tilde{W}) \\ \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \{i : I(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}) > 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\} \right| &= I(\tilde{W}). \end{aligned}$$

This means that the fraction of good channels is about $I(\tilde{W})$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, constructing polar codes is equivalent to choosing the good indices. However, the complexity of the exact computation for a BMS channel with a continuous output alphabet appears to be exponential in the block length. A quantization method was proposed in [34] which transforms a BMS channel with a continuous output alphabet to that with a finite output alphabet. Also, [35] proposed an approximation method to construct polar codes efficiently over any discrete-output BMS channel (13). We combine these two methods together in order to construct polar codes for the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel. It was shown in [34], [35] that with a sufficient number of quantization levels, the approximation error is negligible while the computational complexity is still $O(N \log N)$.

With component polar codes $\mathcal{P}(N, k_\ell)$ for all the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channels ($1 \leq \ell \leq r$), we stack them as in Construction D to build the polar lattice. The following lemma shows that these component codes are nested, which is to guarantee that the multilevel construction creates a lattice [21]. We consider two rules to determine the component codes, for theoretic and practical purposes, respectively. One is the *capacity rule* [21], [26], where we select the channel indices according to a threshold on the mutual information. The other is the *equal-error-probability rule* [26], namely, the same error probability for each level, where we select the channel indices according to a threshold on the Bhattacharyya parameter. The advantage of the equal-error-probability rule based on the Bhattacharyya parameter is that it leads to an upper bound on the error probability. For this reason, we use the equal-error-probability rule in the practical design. It is well known that these two rules will converge as the block length goes to infinity [1].

Lemma 4: For either the capacity rule or the equal-error-probability rule, the component polar codes built in the multilevel construction are nested, i.e., $\mathcal{P}(N, k_1) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(N, k_2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{P}(N, k_r)$.

Proof: Firstly, consider the equal-error-probability rule. By Lemma 4.7 in [32], if a BMS channel $\tilde{V}$ is a degraded version of $\tilde{W}$, then the subchannel $\tilde{V}_N^{(i)}$ is also degraded with respect to $\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{Z}(\tilde{V}_N^{(i)}) \geq \tilde{Z}(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)})$. Let the threshold be 2^{-N^β} for some $\beta < 1/2$. The codewords are generated by $x^{1:N} = u^T G_{\mathcal{I}}$, where $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ is the

submatrix of G whose rows are indexed by information set $\mathcal{I}$. The information sets for these two channels are respectively given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{W}} &= \{i : \tilde{Z}(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}) < 2^{-N^\beta}\}, \\ \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{V}} &= \{i : \tilde{Z}(\tilde{V}_N^{(i)}) < 2^{-N^\beta}\}. \end{cases}$$

Due to the fact that $\tilde{Z}(\tilde{V}_N^{(i)}) \geq \tilde{Z}(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)})$, we have $\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{V}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{W}}$. If we construct polar codes $\mathcal{P}(N, |\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{W}}|)$ over $\tilde{W}$ and $\mathcal{P}(N, |\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{V}}|)$ over $\tilde{V}$, $G_{\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{V}}}$ is a submatrix of $G_{\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{W}}}$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}(N, |\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{V}}|) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(N, |\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{W}}|)$.

From Lemma 3, the channel of the ℓ -th level is always degraded with respect to the channel of the $(\ell + 1)$ -th level, and consequently, $\mathcal{P}(N, k_\ell) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(N, k_{\ell+1})$.

Then, consider the capacity rule. The nesting relation still holds if we select the channel indices according to a threshold on the mutual information. This is because, by Lemma 4.7 in [32], $I(\tilde{V}_N^{(i)}) \leq I(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)})$ if a BMS channel $\tilde{V}$ is a degraded version of $\tilde{W}$. $\square$

C. AWGN Goodness

For a threshold 2^{-N^β} of the Bhattacharyya parameter, the block error probability of the polar code with SC decoding is upper-bounded by $N2^{-N^\beta}$. It can be made arbitrarily small by increasing the block length N . Also, the capacity loss ϵ_3 diminishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 2: Suppose $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})$ is negligible. Construct polar lattice L from the n -dimensional binary lattice partition chain $\Lambda/\Lambda_1/\dots/\Lambda_{r-1}/\Lambda'$ and r nested polar codes with block length N , where $r = O(\log N)$. Then, the error probability of L under multistage decoding is bounded by

$$P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \leq rN2^{-N^\beta} + N \left(1 - \int_{\mathcal{V}(\Lambda')} f_{\tilde{\sigma}^2}(x) dx \right), \quad (14)$$

with the logarithmic VNR bounded by (11). As $N \rightarrow \infty$, L can achieve the Poltyrev capacity, i.e., $\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) \rightarrow 0$ and $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 1: It is worth pointing out that Theorem 2 only requires mild conditions. The condition $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma}) \rightarrow 0$ is easily satisfied by properly scaling the top lattice Λ . In practice, if the target error probability is fixed (e.g., 10^{-5}), r can be a small constant, namely, r does not have to scale as $\log N$. Thus, the essential condition is $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For finite N , however, the capacity loss ϵ_3 is not negligible. We investigate the finite-length performance of polar lattices in the following.

The finite-length analysis of polar codes was given in [36]–[38]. It was proved that polar codes need a polynomial block length with respect to the gap to capacity $\epsilon_{\text{loss}} = I(\tilde{W}) - R = O(N^{-\frac{1}{\mu}})$ [36], [37], where μ is known as the scaling exponent. The lower bound of the gap is $\epsilon_{\text{loss}} \geq \underline{\beta} N^{-\frac{1}{\underline{\mu}}}$, where $\underline{\beta}$ is a constant that depends only on $I(\tilde{W})$ and $\underline{\mu} = 3.55$ [36]. The upper bound of the gap is $\epsilon_{\text{loss}} \leq \bar{\beta} N^{-\frac{1}{\bar{\mu}}}$, where $\bar{\beta}$ is a constant that depends only on the block error probability P_B and $\bar{\mu} = 7$ was given in [36]. Later this scaling factor $\bar{\mu}$ has been improved to 5.77 [38].

Thus, the gap to the Poltyrev capacity of finite-dimensional polar lattices is

$$\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) \leq \frac{2}{n} \left(\epsilon_1 + r\bar{\beta}N^{-\frac{1}{\mu}} \right)$$

with the corresponding block error probability

$$P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) \leq rP_B + P_e(\Lambda'^N, \tilde{\sigma}^2),$$

where the constant $\bar{\beta}$ depends only on P_B (assuming equal error probabilities for the component polar codes). Since $n \ll N$ is fixed, the gap to the Poltyrev capacity of polar lattices also scales polynomially in the dimension $n_L = nN$.

In comparison, the optimal bound for finite-dimensional lattices is given by [39]

$$\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right)_{\text{opt}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n_L}} Q^{-1}(P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2)) - \frac{1}{n_L} \log n_L + O\left(\frac{1}{n_L}\right). \quad (15)$$

At finite dimensions, this is more precise than the exponential error bound for lattices constructed from random linear codes given in [21]. Thus, given $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$, the scaling exponent of optimum random lattices is 2 which is smaller than that of polar lattices $\bar{\mu}$. The result is consistent with the fact that polar codes require larger block length than random codes to achieve the same rate and error probability.

IV. POLARIZATION-BASED LATTICE GAUSSIAN SHAPING

To achieve the capacity of the power-constrained Gaussian channel, we can apply Gaussian shaping over the polar lattice L . However, it appears difficult to do so directly. In this section, we will apply Gaussian shaping to the top lattice Λ instead, which is more friendly for implementation. This is motivated by Theorem 1, which implies that one may construct a capacity-achieving lattice code from a good constellation. More precisely, one may choose a low-dimensional top lattice such as $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^2$ whose mutual information has a negligible gap to the channel capacity as bounded in Theorem 1, and then construct a multilevel code to achieve the capacity. We will show that this strategy is equivalent to implementing Gaussian shaping over the AWGN-good polar lattice. For this purpose, we will employ the recently introduced polar codes for asymmetric channels [6], [7].

A. Asymmetric Channels in Multilevel Lattice Coding

By Theorem 1, we choose a good constellation D_{Λ, σ_s} such that the flatness factor $\epsilon_{\Lambda}(\tilde{\sigma})$ is negligible. Let the binary partition chain $\Lambda/\Lambda_1/\dots/\Lambda_{r-1}/\Lambda'/\dots$ be labelled by bits $X_1, \dots, X_r, \dots$. Then, D_{Λ, σ_s} induces a distribution $P_{X_{1:r}}$ whose limit corresponds to D_{Λ, σ_s} as $r \rightarrow \infty$. An example for $D_{\mathbb{Z}, \sigma_s}$ for $\sigma_s = 3$ is shown in Fig. 2. In this case, a shaping constellation with $M = 32$ points are actually sufficient, since the total probability of these points is rather close to 1.

By the chain rule of mutual information

$$I(Y; X_{1:r}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^r I(Y; X_{\ell} | X_{1:\ell-1}), \quad (16)$$




Fig. 2. Lattice Gaussian distribution D_{Z, σ_s} and the associated labelling.

we obtain r binary-input channels W_ℓ for $1 \leq \ell \leq r$. Given $x_{1:\ell-1}$, denote again by $\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})$ the coset of Λ_ℓ indexed by $x_{1:\ell-1}$ and x_ℓ . According to [26], the channel transition PDF of the ℓ -th channel W_ℓ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & P_{Y|X_\ell, X_{1:\ell-1}}(y|x_\ell, x_{1:\ell-1}) \\
 &= \frac{1}{P\{\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})\}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})} P(a) P_{Y|A}(y|a) \\
 &= \frac{1}{f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell}))} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})} \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_s} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y-a\|^2}{2\sigma_s^2} - \frac{\|a\|^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right) \\
 &= \exp\left(-\frac{\|y\|^2}{2(\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2)}\right) \frac{1}{f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell}))} \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_s} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}{2\sigma_s^2\sigma^2} \left\| \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2} y - a \right\|^2\right) \\
 &= \exp\left(-\frac{\|y\|^2}{2(\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2)}\right) \frac{1}{f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell}))} \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_s} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\alpha y - a\|^2}{2\tilde{\sigma}^2}\right). \tag{17}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we recall the MMSE coefficient $\alpha = \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}$, and $\tilde{\sigma} = \frac{\sigma_s\sigma}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}}$. In general, W_ℓ is asymmetric with the input distribution $P_{X_\ell|X_{1:\ell-1}}$, unless $f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell}))/f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_{\ell-1}(x_{1:\ell-1})) \approx \frac{1}{2}$ which means that $\epsilon_{\Lambda_\ell}(\sigma_s)$ is negligible.

For a finite power, the number of levels does not need to be large. The following lemma shows in a quantitative manner how large r should be in order to achieve the channel capacity. The proof can be found in Appendix D.

Lemma 5: If $r = O(\log \log N)$, the mutual information of the bottom level $I(Y; X_r | X_{1:r-1}) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, using the first r levels only incurs a capacity loss $\sum_{\ell > r} I(Y; X_\ell | X_{1:\ell-1}) \leq O(\frac{1}{N})$.

Remark 2: The condition $r = O(\log \log N)$ is again theoretic. In practice, r can be a small constant so that the different between $I(Y; X_{1:r})$ and capacity is negligible, as we will see from the example in the next section.

B. Polar Codes for Asymmetric Channels

Since the component channels are asymmetric, we need polar codes for asymmetric channels to achieve their capacity. Fortunately, polar codes for the binary memoryless asymmetric (BMA) channels have been introduced in

[6], [7] recently.

Definition 4 (Bhattacharyya Parameter for BMA Channel [6], [40]): Let W be a BMA channel with input $X \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ and output $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and let P_X and $P_{Y|X}$ denote The input distribution and channel transition probability, respectively. The Bhattacharyya parameter Z for channel W is the defined as

$$\begin{aligned} Z(X|Y) &= 2 \sum_y P_Y(y) \sqrt{P_{X|Y}(0|y) P_{X|Y}(1|y)} \\ &= 2 \sum_y \sqrt{P_{X,Y}(0, y) P_{X,Y}(1, y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that Definition 4 is the same as Definition 3 when P_X is uniform.

The following lemma shows that adding an observable at the output of W will not decrease Z .

Lemma 6 (Conditioning reduces Bhattacharyya parameter Z): Let $(X, Y, Y') \sim P_{X,Y,Y'}$, $X \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $Y' \in \mathcal{Y}'$, we have

$$Z(X|Y, Y') \leq Z(X|Y).$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} Z(X|Y, Y') &= 2 \sum_{y, y'} \sqrt{P_{X,Y,Y'}(0, y, y') P_{X,Y,Y'}(1, y, y')} \\ &= 2 \sum_y \sum_{y'} \sqrt{P_{X,Y,Y'}(0, y, y')} \sqrt{P_{X,Y,Y'}(1, y, y')} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2 \sum_y \sqrt{\sum_{y'} P_{X,Y,Y'}(0, y, y')} \sqrt{\sum_{y'} P_{X,Y,Y'}(1, y, y')} \\ &= 2 \sum_y \sqrt{P_{X,Y}(0, y) P_{X,Y}(1, y)} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. $\square$

Let $X^{1:N}$ and $Y^{1:N}$ be the input and output vector after N independent uses of W . For simplicity, denote the distribution of (X^i, Y^i) by $P_{XY} = P_X P_{Y|X}$ for $i \in [N]$. The following property of the polarized random variables $U^{1:N} = X^{1:N} G_N$ is well known.

Theorem 3 (Polarization of Random Variables [6]): For any $\beta \in (0, 0.5)$,

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ i : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta} \right\} \right| &= H(X), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ i : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta} \right\} \right| &= 1 - H(X), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ i : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta} \right\} \right| &= H(Y|X), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ i : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta} \right\} \right| &= 1 - H(Y|X), \end{aligned} \right. \quad (18)$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ i : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta} \text{ and } Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta} \right\} \right| = I(X; Y), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ i : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \geq 2^{-N^\beta} \text{ or } Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}) \leq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta} \right\} \right| = 1 - I(X; Y). \end{array} \right. \quad (19)$$

The Bhattacharyya parameter for asymmetric models was originally defined for distributed source coding in [40]. By the duality between channel coding and source coding, it can be also used to construct capacity-achieving polar codes for BMA channels [6]. Actually, $Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1})$ is the Bhattacharyya parameter for a single source X (without side information).

The Bhattacharyya parameter of a BMA channel can be related to that of a symmetric channel. To this aim, we use a symmetrization technique which creates a BMS channel $\tilde{W}$ from the BMA channel W . The following lemma was implicit in [6]; here we make it explicit.

Lemma 7 (Symmetrization): Let $\tilde{W}$ be a binary input channel with input $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ and output $\tilde{Y} \in \{\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}\}$, built from the asymmetric channel W as shown in Fig. 3. Suppose the input of $\tilde{W}$ is uniformly distributed, i.e., $P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x} = 0) = P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x} = 1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\tilde{W}$ is a binary symmetric channel in the sense that $P_{\tilde{Y}|\tilde{X}}(y, x \oplus \tilde{x}|\tilde{x}) = P_{Y,X}(y, x)$.




Fig. 3. The relationship between the asymmetric channel W and the symmetrized channel $\tilde{W}$.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\tilde{Y}|\tilde{X}}(y, x \oplus \tilde{x}|\tilde{x}) &= \frac{P_{\tilde{Y},\tilde{X}}(y, x \oplus \tilde{x}, \tilde{x})}{P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x})} = \frac{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} P_{\tilde{Y},X,\tilde{X}}(y, x \oplus \tilde{x}, x', \tilde{x})}{P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x})} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} P_{Y|X}(y|x') P_{X \oplus \tilde{X}, X, \tilde{X}}(x \oplus \tilde{x}, x', \tilde{x})}{P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x})} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} P_{Y|X}(y|x') P_{X \oplus \tilde{X}|X, \tilde{X}}(x \oplus \tilde{x}|x', \tilde{x}) P_X(x') P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x})}{P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x})} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} P_{Y,X}(y, x). \end{aligned}$$

The equalities (a)-(c) follow from (a) Y is only dependent on X , (b) X and $\tilde{X}$ are independent to each other and (c) $P_{X \oplus \tilde{X}|X, \tilde{X}}(x \oplus \tilde{x}|x', \tilde{x}) = \mathbf{1}(x' = x)$. $\square$

The following theorem connects the Bhattacharyya Parameter of a BMA channel W and that of the symmetrized channel $\tilde{W}$. Denote by W_N and $\tilde{W}_N$ the combining channels of N uses of W and $\tilde{W}$, respectively.

Theorem 4 (Connection Between Bhattacharyya Parameters [6]): Let $\tilde{X}^{1:N}$ and $\tilde{Y}^{1:N} = (X^{1:N} \oplus \tilde{X}^{1:N}, Y^{1:N})$ be the input and output vectors of $\tilde{W}$, respectively, and let $U^{1:N} = X^{1:N} G_N$ and $\tilde{U}^{1:N} = \tilde{X}^{1:N} G_N$. The Bhattacharyya parameter of each subchannel of W_N is equal to that of each subchannel of $\tilde{W}_N$, i.e.,

$$Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) = \tilde{Z}(\tilde{U}^i | \tilde{U}^{1:i-1}, X^{1:N} \oplus \tilde{X}^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}).$$

Now, we are in a position to construct polar codes for the BMA channel. Define the frozen set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and information set $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ of the symmetric polar codes as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{frozen set: } \tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \{i \in [N] : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) > 2^{-N^\beta}\} \\ \text{information set: } \tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \{i \in [N] : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta}\}. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

By Theorem 4, the Bhattacharyya parameters of the symmetric channel $\tilde{W}$ and the asymmetric channel W are the same. However, the channel capacity of $\tilde{W}$ is $I(\tilde{X}; X \oplus \tilde{X}) + I(\tilde{X}; Y | X \oplus \tilde{X}) = 1 - H(X) + I(X; Y)$, which is $1 - H(X)$ more than the capacity of W . To obtain the real capacity $I(X; Y)$ of W , the input distribution of W needs to be adjusted to P_X . By polar lossless source coding, the indices with very small $Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1})$ should be removed from the information set $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ of the symmetrized channel, and the proportion of this part is $1 - H(X)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We name this set as the information set $\mathcal{I}$ of the asymmetric channel W . Further, there are some bits which are uniformly distributed and can be made independent from the information bits; we name this set as the frozen set $\mathcal{F}$. In order to generate the desired input distribution P_X , the remaining bits are determined from the bits in $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{I}$; we call it the shaping set $\mathcal{S}$. This process is depicted in Fig. 4. We formally define the three sets as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{frozen set: } \mathcal{F} = \{i \in [N] : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\} \\ \text{information set: } \mathcal{I} = \{i \in [N] : Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta} \text{ and } Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\} \\ \text{shaping set: } \mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{I})^c. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

To find these sets, one can use Theorem 4 to calculate $Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N})$ with the known technique for symmetric polar codes [34], [41]. We note that $Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1})$ can be computed in a similar way: one constructs a symmetric channel between $\tilde{X}$ and $X \oplus \tilde{X}$, which is actually a binary symmetric channel with cross probability $P_X(x = 1)$. The above construction is equivalent to implementing shaping over the polar code for the symmetrized channel $\tilde{W}$.

Besides the construction, the decoding can also be converted to that of the symmetric polar code. If $X^{1:N} \oplus \tilde{X}^{1:N} = 0$, we have $U^{1:N} = \tilde{U}^{1:N}$, which means the decoding result of $U^{1:N}$ equals to that of $\tilde{U}^{1:N}$. Thus, decoding of the polar code for W can be treated as decoding of the polar code for $\tilde{W}$ given that $X \oplus \tilde{X} = 0$. Clearly, the SC decoding complexity for asymmetric channel is also $O(N \log N)$. We summarize this observation as the following lemma.

Lemma 8 (Decoding for Asymmetric Channel [6]): Let $y^{1:N}$ be a realization of $Y^{1:N}$ and $\hat{u}^{1:i-1}$ be the previous




Fig. 4. Polarization for symmetric and asymmetric channels.

$i - 1$ estimates of $u^{1:N}$. The likelihood ratio of u^i is given by

$$\frac{P_{U^i|U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}}(0|\hat{u}^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N})}{P_{U^i|U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}}(1|\hat{u}^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N})} = \frac{\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}((y^{1:N}, 0^{1:N}), \hat{u}^{1:i-1}|0)}{\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}((y^{1:N}, 0^{1:N}), \hat{u}^{1:i-1}|1)}, \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}$ denotes the transition probability of the i -th subchannel of $\tilde{W}_N$.

In [6], the bits in $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{S}$ are all chosen according to $P_{U^i|U^{1:i-1}}(u^i|u^{1:i-1})$, which can also be calculated using (22) (treating Y as an independent variable and remove it). However, in order to be compatible with polar lattices, we modify the scheme such that the bits in $\mathcal{F}$ are uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}$ while the bits in $\mathcal{S}$ are still chosen according to $P_{U^i|U^{1:i-1}}(u^i|u^{1:i-1})$. The expectation of the decoding error probability still vanishes with N . The following theorem is an extension of the result in [6, Theorem 3]. We give the proof in Appendix E for completeness.

Theorem 5: Consider a polar code with the following encoding and decoding strategies for a BMA channel.

- Encoding: Before sending the codeword $x^{1:N} = u^{1:N}G_N$, the index set $[N]$ are divided into three parts: the frozen set $\mathcal{F}$, the information set $\mathcal{I}$ and the shaping set $\mathcal{S}$ which are defined in (21). The encoder places uniformly distributed information bits in $\mathcal{I}$, and fills $\mathcal{F}$ with a uniform random $\{0, 1\}$ sequence which is shared between the encoder and the decoder. The bits in $\mathcal{S}$ are generated by a mapping $\phi_{\mathcal{S}} \triangleq \{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ in the family of randomized mappings $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}}$, which yields the following distribution:

$$u^i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } P_{U^i|U^{1:i-1}}(0|u^{1:i-1}), \\ 1 & \text{with probability } P_{U^i|U^{1:i-1}}(1|u^{1:i-1}). \end{cases}$$

- Decoding: The decoder receives $y^{1:N}$ and estimates $\hat{u}^{1:N}$ of $u^{1:N}$ according to the rule

$$\hat{u}^i = \begin{cases} u^i, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{F} \\ \phi_i(\hat{u}^{1:i-1}), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S} \\ \underset{u}{\operatorname{argmax}} P_{U^i|U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}}(u|\hat{u}^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N}), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}. \end{cases}$$

With the above encoding and decoding, the message rate can be arbitrarily close to $I(Y; X)$ and the expectation of the decoding error probability over the randomized mappings satisfies $E_{\Phi_S}[P_e(\phi_S)] \leq N2^{-N^{\beta'}}$ for $\beta' < \beta < 0.5$. Consequently, there exists a deterministic mapping ϕ_S such that $P_e(\phi_S) \leq N2^{-N^{\beta'}}$.

In practice, to share the mapping ϕ_S between the encoder and the decoder, we can let them have access to the same source of randomness, e.g., using the same seed for the pseudorandom number generators.

C. Multilevel Polar Codes

Next, our task is to construct polar codes to achieve the mutual information $I(Y; X_\ell | X_{1:\ell-1})$ for all levels. The construction of the preceding subsection is readily applicable to the construction for the first level W_1 . To demonstrate the construction for other levels, we take the channel of the second level W_2 as an example. This is also a BMA channel with input $X_2 \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, output $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and side information X_1 . Its channel transition probability is shown in (17). To construct a polar code for the second level, we propose the following two-step procedure.




Fig. 5. The first step of polarization in the construction for the second level.

Step 1: Construct a polar code for the BMS channel with input vector $\tilde{X}_2^{1:N} = [\tilde{X}_2^1, \tilde{X}_2^2, \dots, \tilde{X}_2^N]$ and output vector $\tilde{Y}^{1:N} = (X_2^{1:N} \oplus \tilde{X}_2^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N})$ where $\tilde{X}_2^i \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$ is uniformly distributed. At this step X_1 is regarded as the output. Then the distribution of X_2 becomes the marginal distribution $\sum_{x_1, x_{3:r}} P_{X_{1:r}}(x_{1:r})$. Consider polarized random variables $U_2^{1:N} = X_2^{1:N} G_N$ and $\tilde{U}_2^{1:N} = \tilde{X}_2^{1:N} G_N$. According to Theorem 3, the polarization gives us the three sets $\mathcal{F}_2$, $\mathcal{I}_2'$ and $\mathcal{S}_2'$ as shown in Fig. 5. Similarly, we can prove that




Fig. 6. The second step of polarization in the construction for the second level.

$\frac{|\mathcal{I}'_2|}{N} \rightarrow I(Y, X_1; X_2)$ and $\frac{|\mathcal{F}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}'_2|}{N} \rightarrow 1 - I(Y, X_1; X_2)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. These three sets are defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{frozen set: } \mathcal{F}_2 = \{i \in [N] : Z(U_2^i | U_2^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\} \\ \text{information set: } \mathcal{I}'_2 = \{i \in [N] : Z(U_2^i | U_2^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta} \text{ and } Z(U_2^i | U_2^{1:i-1}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\} \\ \text{shaping set: } \mathcal{S}'_2 = (\mathcal{F}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}'_2)^c. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Step 2: Treat $X_1^{1:N}$ as the side information for the encoder. Given $X_1^{1:N}$, the choices of $X_2^{1:N}$ are further restricted since X_1 and X_2 are generally correlated, i.e., $P_{X_1, X_2}(x_1, x_2) = f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}(x_1, x_2)) / f_{\sigma_s}(\Lambda)$ (cf. Fig. 2). By removing from $\mathcal{I}'_2$ the bits which are almost deterministic given $U_2^{1:i-1}$ and $X_1^{1:N}$, we obtain the information set $\mathcal{I}_2$ for W_2 . Then the distribution of the input X_2 becomes the conditional distribution $P_{X_2|X_1}(x_2|x_1)$. The process is shown in Fig. 6. More precisely, the indices are divided into three portions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \underbrace{1 - I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2, X_1, Y)}_{\mathcal{F}_2} + I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2, X_1, Y) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Step 1}}{=} \underbrace{1 - I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2, X_1, Y)}_{\mathcal{F}_2} + \underbrace{I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2)}_{\mathcal{S}'_2} + \underbrace{I(\tilde{X}_2; X_1, Y | \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2)}_{\mathcal{I}'_2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Step 2}}{=} \underbrace{1 - I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2, X_1, Y)}_{\mathcal{F}_2} + \underbrace{I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2)}_{\mathcal{S}'_2} + \underbrace{I(\tilde{X}_2; X_1 | \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2)}_{\mathcal{S}_{X_1}} + \underbrace{I(\tilde{X}_2; Y | X_1, \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2)}_{\mathcal{I}_2} \\ &= \underbrace{1 - I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2, X_1, Y)}_{\mathcal{F}_2} + \underbrace{1 - H(X_2)}_{\mathcal{S}'_2} + \underbrace{I(X_2; X_1)}_{\mathcal{S}_{X_1}} + \underbrace{I(X_2; Y | X_1)}_{\mathcal{I}_2} \\ &= \underbrace{1 - I(\tilde{X}_2; \tilde{X}_2 \oplus X_2, X_1, Y)}_{\mathcal{F}_2} + \underbrace{1 - H(X_2 | X_1)}_{\mathcal{S}_2} + \underbrace{I(X_2; Y | X_1)}_{\mathcal{I}_2} \end{aligned}$$

We give the formal statement of this procedure in the following lemma.

Lemma 9: After the first step of polarization, we obtain the three sets $\mathcal{F}_2$, $\mathcal{I}'_2$ and $\mathcal{S}'_2$ in (23). Let $\mathcal{S}_{X_1}$ denote the

set of indices whose Bhattacharyya parameters satisfy $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta}$, $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}) \leq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}$ and $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}$. The proportion of $\mathcal{S}_{X_1}$ is asymptotically given by $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}_{X_1}|}{N} = I(X_2; X_1)$. Then by removing $\mathcal{S}_{X_1}$ from $\mathcal{I}'_2$, we obtain the true information set $\mathcal{I}_2$ for W_2 . Formally, the three sets are obtained as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{frozen set: } \mathcal{F}_2 = \{i \in [N] : Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\} \\ \text{information set: } \mathcal{I}_2 = \{i \in [N] : Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta} \text{ and } Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\} \\ \text{shaping set: } \mathcal{S}_2 = (\mathcal{F}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_2)^c. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Proof: Firstly, we show the proportion of set $\mathcal{S}_{X_1}$ goes to $I(X_1; X_2)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Here we define a slightly different set $\mathcal{S}'_{X_1} = \{i \in [N] : Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta} \text{ and } Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}\}$. Suppose we are constructing an asymmetric polar code for the channel from X_1 to X_2 ; it is not difficult to find that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}'_{X_1}|}{N} = I(X_2; X_1)$ by Theorem 5. Furthermore, by Lemma 6, if $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta}$, we can immediately have $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta}$. Therefore, the difference between the definitions of $\mathcal{S}_{X_1}$ and $\mathcal{S}'_{X_1}$ only lies on $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N})$. Denoting by $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{X_1}$ the unpolarized set with $2^{-N^\beta} \leq Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}) \leq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}_{X_1}|}{N} - \frac{|\mathcal{S}'_{X_1}|}{N} \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{X_1}|}{N} = 0. \quad (25)$$

As a result, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}_{X_1}|}{N} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{S}'_{X_1}|}{N} = I(X_2; X_1)$.

Secondly, we show that $\mathcal{S}_{X_1} \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I}'_2$. Again, by Lemma 6, if $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}$, we get $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}) \geq 1 - 2^{-N^\beta}$ and the difference between the definitions of $\mathcal{S}_{X_1}$ and $\mathcal{I}'_2$ only lies on $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N})$. Observe that the union $\mathcal{S}_{X_1} \cup \mathcal{I}_2$ would remove the condition on $Z(U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N})$, and accordingly we have $\mathcal{S}_{X_1} \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = \mathcal{I}'_2$. It can be also found that the proportion of $\mathcal{I}_2$ goes to $I(X_2; Y|X_1)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

We summarize our main results in the following theorem:

Theorem 6 (Coding Theorem for Multilevel Polar Codes): Consider a polar code with the following encoding and decoding strategies for the channel of the second level W_2 with the channel transition probability $P_{Y|X_2, X_1}(y|x_2, x_1)$ shown in (17).

- Encoding: Before sending the codeword $x_2^{1:N} = u_2^{1:N} G_N$, the index set $[N]$ are divided into three parts: the frozen set $\mathcal{F}_2$, information set $\mathcal{I}_2$, and shaping set $\mathcal{S}_2$. The encoder first places uniformly distributed information bits in $\mathcal{I}_2$. Then the frozen set $\mathcal{F}_2$ is filled with a uniform random sequence which are shared between the encoder and the decoder. The bits in $\mathcal{S}_2$ are generated by a mapping $\phi_{\mathcal{S}_2} \triangleq \{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}_2}$ form a family of randomized mappings $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}_2}$, which yields the following distribution:

$$u_2^i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } P_{U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}}(0|u_2^{1:i-1}, x_1^{1:N}), \\ 1 & \text{with probability } P_{U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}}(1|u_2^{1:i-1}, x_1^{1:N}). \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

- Decoding: The decoder receives $y^{1:N}$ and estimates $\hat{u}_2^{1:N}$ based on the previously recovered $x_1^{1:N}$ according

to the rule

$$\hat{u}_2^i = \begin{cases} u_2^i, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{F}_2 \\ \phi_i(\hat{u}_2^{1:i-1}), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S}_2 \\ \operatorname{argmax}_u P_{U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(u|\hat{u}_2^{1:i-1}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}_2 \end{cases}.$$

Note that probability $P_{U_2^i|U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(u|\hat{u}_2^{1:i-1}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N})$ can be calculated by (22) efficiently, treating Y and X_1 (already decoded by the SC decoder at level 1) as the outputs of the asymmetric channel. With the above encoding and decoding, the message rate can be arbitrarily close to $I(Y; X_2|X_1)$ and the expectation of the decoding error probability over the randomized mappings satisfies $E_{\Phi_{S_2}}[P_e(\phi_{S_2})] \leq N2^{-N^{\beta'}}$ for any $\beta' < \beta < 0.5$. Consequently, there exists a deterministic mapping ϕ_{S_2} such that $P_e(\phi_{S_2}) \leq N2^{-N^{\beta'}}$.

The proof of this theorem is given in Appendix F.

Obviously, Theorem 6 can be generalized to the construction of a polar code for the channel of the ℓ -th level W_ℓ . The only difference is that the side information changes from $X_1^{1:N}$ to $X_{1:\ell-1}^{1:N}$. As a result, we can construct a polar code which achieves a rate arbitrarily close to $I(Y; X_\ell|X_{1:\ell})$ with vanishing error probability. We omit the proof for the sake of brevity.

D. Achieving Channel Capacity

So far, we have constructed polar codes to achieve the capacity of the induced asymmetric channels for all levels. Since the sum capacity of the component channels nearly equals the mutual information $I(Y; X)$, and since we choose a good constellation such that $I(Y; X) \approx \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR})$, we have constructed a lattice code to achieve the capacity of the Gaussian channel. We summarize the construction in the following theorem:

Theorem 7: Choose a good constellation with negligible flatness factor $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})$ and negligible ϵ_t as in Theorem 1, and construct a multilevel polar code with $r = O(\log \log N)$ as above. Then, for any SNR, the message rate approaches $\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR})$, while the error probability under multistage decoding is bounded by

$$P_e \leq rN2^{-N^{\beta'}}, \quad 0 < \beta' < 0.5 \quad (27)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 3: It is simple to generate a transmitted codeword of the proposed scheme. For $n = 1$, let

$$\chi = \sum_{\ell=1}^r 2^{\ell-1} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\ell} u_\ell^i \mathbf{g}_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} u_\ell^i \mathbf{g}_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_\ell} u_\ell^i \mathbf{g}_i \right]. \quad (28)$$

The transmitted codeword x is drawn from $D_{2^r \mathbb{Z}^N + \chi}, \sigma_s$. From the proof of Lemma 5, we know that the probability of choosing a point outside of the interval $[-2^{r-1}, 2^{r-1}]$ is negligible if r is sufficiently large, which implies there exists only one point in this interval with probability close to 1. Therefore, one may simply transmit $x = \chi \bmod 2^r$, where the modulo operation is applied component-wise with range $(-2^{r-1}, 2^{r-1}]$.

Next, we show that such a multilevel polar coding scheme is equivalent to Gaussian shaping over a coset $L + c'$ of a polar lattice L for some translate c' . In fact, the polar lattice L is exactly constructed from the

corresponding symmetrized channels $\tilde{W}_\ell$. Recall that the ℓ -th channel W_ℓ is a BMA channel with the input distribution $P(X_\ell|X_{1:\ell-1})$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq r$). It is clear that $P_{X_{1:\ell}}(x_{1:\ell}) = f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell}))/f_{\sigma_s}(\Lambda)$. By Lemma 7 and (17), the transition probability of the symmetrized channel $\tilde{W}_\ell$ is

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\tilde{W}_\ell}((y, x_{1:\ell-1}, x_\ell \oplus \tilde{x}_\ell)|\tilde{x}_\ell) &= P_{Y, X_{1:\ell}}(y, x_{1:\ell}) \\ &= P_{X_{1:\ell}}(x_{1:\ell}) P_{Y|X_\ell, X_{1:\ell-1}}(y|x_\ell, x_{1:\ell-1}) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{\|y\|^2}{2(\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2)}\right) \frac{1}{f_{\sigma_s}(\Lambda)} \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma\sigma_s} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})} \exp\left(-\frac{\|\alpha y - a\|^2}{2\tilde{\sigma}^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Note that the difference between the asymmetric channel (17) and symmetrized channel (29) is the *a priori* probability $P_{X_{1:\ell}}(x_{1:\ell}) = f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell}))/f_{\sigma_s}(\Lambda)$. Comparing with the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel (13), we see that the symmetrized channel (29) is equivalent to a $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel, since the common terms in front of the sum will be completely cancelled out in the calculation of the likelihood ratio⁴. We summarize the foregoing analysis in the following lemma:

Lemma 10 (Equivalence lemma): Consider a multilevel lattice code constructed from constellation D_{Λ, σ_s} for a Gaussian channel with noise variance σ^2 . The ℓ -th symmetric channel $\tilde{W}_\ell$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq r$) which is derived from the asymmetric channel W_ℓ is equivalent to the MMSE-scaled $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel with noise variance $\tilde{\sigma}^2$.

Thus, the resultant polar codes for the symmetrized channels are nested, and the polar lattice is AWGN-good for noise variance $\tilde{\sigma}^2$; also, the multistage decoding is performed on the MMSE-scaled signal αy (cf. Lemma 8). Since the frozen sets of the polar codes are filled with random bits (rather than all zeros), we actually obtain a coset $L + c'$ of the polar lattice, where the shift c' accounts for the effects of all random frozen bits. Finally, since we start from D_{Λ, σ_s} , we would obtain D_{Λ^N, σ_s} without coding; since $L + c' \subset \Lambda^N$ by construction, we obtain a discrete Gaussian distribution D_{L+c', σ_s} over $L + c'$.

Remark 4: This analysis shows that our proposed scheme is an explicit construction of lattice Gaussian coding introduced in [11], which applies Gaussian shaping to an AWGN-good lattice (or its coset). Note that the condition of negligible $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})$ in Theorem 7 is the same as the condition on Λ imposed in the construction of polar lattice in Section III (cf. Theorem 2). Again, it is always possible to scale down the top lattice Λ such that both $\epsilon_\Lambda(\tilde{\sigma})$ and ϵ_ℓ become negligible in Theorem 1. Thus, Theorem 7 holds for any SNR, meaning that we have removed the condition $\text{SNR} > e$ required by [11, Theorem 3]⁵. Moreover, if a good constellation of the form $D_{\Lambda-c, \sigma_s}$ for some shift c is used in practice (e.g., a constellation taking values in $\{\pm 1, \pm 3, \dots\}$), the proposed construction holds verbatim.

Remark 5: By [11, Lemma 1], the power P of a discrete Gaussian distribution D_{L+c', σ_s} is never greater than σ_s^2 .

⁴Even if $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in (29), the sum over $\mathcal{A}_\ell(x_{1:\ell})$ is Λ_ℓ -periodic. Hence, the likelihood ratio will be the same if one takes $\bar{y} = y \bmod \Lambda_\ell$ and uses (13).

⁵The reason of the condition $\text{SNR} > e$ in [11] is that a more stringent condition is imposed on the flatness factor of L , namely, $\epsilon_L\left(\frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma^2}}\right)$ is negligible.




Fig. 7. Channel capacity for partition chain $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}/\cdots/2^r\mathbb{Z}$. The discrete approximation used in Sect. III-B is also shown.

Remark 6: A shaping method was proposed in [11, Section IV], where Gaussian shaping is only performed on the bottom lattice. However, it requires negligible $\epsilon_{\Lambda'}(\sigma_s)$, which does not hold in general.

V. DESIGN EXAMPLES

In this section, we give design examples of polar lattices based on one and two-dimensional partition chains, with and without the power constraint. The design follows the equal-error-probability rule. Multistage SC decoding is applied. Since the complexity of SC decoding is $O(N \log N)$, the overall decoding complexity is $O(rN \log N)$.

A. Design Examples Without Power Constraint

1) *One-Dimensional Lattice Partition:* Consider the one-dimensional lattice partition $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}/\cdots/2^r\mathbb{Z}$. To construct a multilevel lattice, one needs to determine the number of levels of lattice partitions and the actual rates according to the target error probability for a given noise variance. By the guidelines given in Section II-C, the effective levels are those which can achieve the target error probability with an actual rate not too close to either 0 or 1. Therefore, one can determine the number of effective levels with the help of capacity curves in Fig. 7. For example, at the given noise variance indicated by the straight line in Fig. 7, one may choose two levels of component codes, which was indeed suggested in [21].

The multilevel construction and the multistage decoding are shown in Fig. 8. For the ℓ -th level, $\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{k_\ell}$ are a set of code generators chosen from the matrix G_N , and σ_ℓ is the standard deviation of the noise.

Now, we give an example for length $N = 1024$ and target error probability $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) = 10^{-5}$. Since the bottom level is a $\mathbb{Z}^N$ lattice decoder, $\sigma_3 \approx 0.0845$ for target error probability $\frac{1}{3} \cdot 10^{-5}$. For the middle level, $\sigma_2 = 2 \cdot \sigma_3 = 0.1690$. From Fig. 7, the channel capacity of the middle level is $C(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}, \sigma_2^2) = C(2\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}, \sigma_1^2) = 0.9874$. For




Fig. 8. A polar lattice with two levels, where $\sigma_1 = \tilde{\sigma}$.

the top level, $\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma_1 = 0.3380$ and the capacity is 0.5145. Our goal is to find two polar codes approaching the respective capacities at block error probabilities $\leq \frac{1}{3} \cdot 10^{-5}$ over these binary-input mod-2 channels.

For $N = 1024$, we found the first polar code with $\frac{k_1}{N} = 0.23$ for $P_e(\mathcal{C}_1, \sigma_1^2) \approx \frac{1}{3} \cdot 10^{-5}$, and the second polar code with $\frac{k_2}{N} = 0.9$ for $P_e(\mathcal{C}_2, \sigma_2^2) \approx \frac{1}{3} \cdot 10^{-5}$. Thus, the sum rate of component polar codes $R_C = 0.23 + 0.9$, implying a capacity loss $\epsilon_3 = 0.3719$. Meanwhile, the factor $\epsilon_1 = C(\mathbb{Z}, 0.3380^2) = 0.0160$. From (11), the logarithmic VNR is given by

$$\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) \leq 2(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_3) = 0.7758, \quad (30)$$

which is 2.34 dB. Fig. 9 shows the simulation results for this example. It is seen that the estimate 2.34 dB is very close to the actual gap at $P_e(L, \sigma_1^2) \approx 10^{-5}$. This simulation indicates that the performance of the component codes is very important to the multilevel lattice. The gap to the Poltyrev capacity is largely due to the capacity losses of component codes.

Thanks to density evolution [41], the upper bound $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} (\tilde{Z}(\tilde{W}_N^{(i)}))$ on the block error probability of a polar code with finite-length can be calculated numerically. According to (27), we plot the upper bound on the block error probability $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$ of the polar lattice in Fig. 9, which is quite tight.

Now we revisit the Barnes-Wall lattice with its performance shown in Fig. 9. We know that there are only 2 effective levels, but the Barnes-Wall lattice (4) has 5 levels for $N = 1024$. The reason for its relatively poor performance is that it violates the capacity rule: at some levels, the rate of the code exceeds the capacity of the equivalent channel. For example, the rate of the first level is 0.01, which exceeds the capacity of the first level. Another reason is the relatively weak error-correction ability of Reed-Muller codes. Therefore, the error probability of the first level will be high in the low VNR region. Also shown in Fig. 9 is our prior design [23], where we followed the structure of the Barnes-Wall lattice, but changed the Reed-Muller code to a polar code on each level. It is seen that replacing the Barnes-Wall rule with our new design yields significantly improved performance.




Fig. 9. Block error probabilities of polar lattices and Barnes-Wall (BW) lattices of length $N = 1024$ with multistage decoding.




Fig. 10. Channel capacity of the two-dimensional lattice partition.

We use the same multistage decoder for both polar lattices and Barnes-Wall lattices. Thus, the encoding and decoding complexity of polar lattices is almost the same as that of Barnes-Wall lattices.

2) *Two-Dimensional Lattice Partition*: We use the two-dimensional lattice partition $\mathbb{Z}^2/R\mathbb{Z}^2/2\mathbb{Z}^2/2R\mathbb{Z}^2/4\mathbb{Z}^2$ as an example⁶. The capacities of the component channels are shown in Fig. 10. According to the rule of level selection, the number of effective levels for component codes is 4.

This polar lattice with two-dimensional lattice partition is depicted in Fig. 11. It consists of all vectors of the

⁶With some abuse of notation, here R denotes the rotation operator represented by matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ [31].




Fig. 11. A polar lattice with five levels, where $\sigma_1 = \tilde{\sigma}$.

form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} u_1^i \mathbf{g}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}'_1 + \cdots + \sum_{i=1}^{k_4} u_4^i \mathbf{g}_i \otimes \mathbf{g}'_4 + x, \quad (31)$$

where $x \in (4\mathbb{Z}^2)^N$ and $\mathbf{g}'_\ell$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq 4$) is the generator of the coset representative $[\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell]$ for the partition $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ [31]. $\mathbf{g}'_\ell$ is an element of $\Lambda_{\ell-1}$ but not of Λ_ℓ ; more specifically, $\mathbf{g}'_1 = (1, 0)$, $\mathbf{g}'_2 = (1, 1)$, $\mathbf{g}'_3 = (2, 0)$, and $\mathbf{g}'_4 = (2, 2)$. In fact, $\mathbf{g}_{\ell+1} = \mathbf{g}_\ell \cdot R$. Each level is equivalent to a binary-input mod- $R\mathbb{Z}^2$ channel. We note here $\sigma_\ell = \sqrt{2}\sigma_{\ell+1}$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq 4$. Then (31) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^4 \sum_{i=1}^{k_\ell} u_\ell^i \mathbf{g}_i \otimes (\mathbf{g}'_1 \cdot R^{\ell-1}) + x.$$

The calculation the channel likelihood ratio is a coset decoding problem. After the mod- $R\mathbb{Z}^2$ operation, the PDF of the Gaussian noise is given by

$$f_{\tilde{\sigma}, R\mathbb{Z}^2}(w) = \sum_{\lambda \in R\mathbb{Z}^2} f_{\tilde{\sigma}}(w + \lambda), \quad w \in \mathcal{R}(R\mathbb{Z}^2).$$

Therefore the likelihood ratio is

$$\text{LR} = \frac{f_{\tilde{\sigma}, R\mathbb{Z}^2}(w)}{f_{\tilde{\sigma}, R\mathbb{Z}^2}(w - (1, 0))}.$$

For a fair comparison, let us design such a polar lattice for $n = 2$ and $N = 512$, thus the same dimension $n_L = 1024$, for target error probability $P_e(L, \tilde{\sigma}^2) = 10^{-5}$. Since $r = 5$, $\sigma_5 \approx 0.083$ to make sure the error probability of the bottom level is $\frac{1}{5} \cdot 10^{-5}$. We also have $\sigma_1 = \sigma_5 \cdot (\sqrt{2})^4 = 0.332$. The actual rates of the component codes to achieve $\frac{1}{5} \cdot 10^{-5}$ are found to be 0.07, 0.40, 0.825 and 0.981, respectively. The channel




Fig. 12. Block error probabilities of polar lattices with multistage decoding.




Fig. 13. SER of lattices with dimension around 1000.

capacities for each level are 0.2488, 0.7064, 0.9666 and 0.9996. Meanwhile, $\epsilon_1 = C(\mathbb{Z}^2, 0.332^2) = 0.0374$ and $\epsilon_3 = 0.6453$. From (11), the gap to the Poltyrev capacity is

$$\log \left(\frac{\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma})}{2\pi e} \right) = \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_3 = 0.6827,$$

which is 2.05 dB. Again, the gap to the Poltyrev capacity is largely due to the capacity losses of component codes.

The simulation result of a polar lattice with $N = 4096$ and $n = 2$ (so the dimension is $n_L = 8192$) is also shown in Fig. 12. For this lattice, the gap to the Poltyrev capacity is only 1.5 dB at block error probability 10^{-5} .

3) *Comparison*: The performance comparison of competing lattices approaching the Poltyrev capacity with dimension around 1000 is shown in Fig. 13 in terms of the symbol error rate (SER)⁷. The polar lattice used here is constructed from the two-dimensional lattice partition ($N = 512, n = 2$). The simulation curves of other lattices are obtained from their corresponding papers. We note that the theoretic minimum gap to the Poltyrev capacity is about 1 dB for dimension 1000 [39]. Among the four types of lattices compared, the LDPC lattice [17] has the weakest performance, while all other three have similar performance at this dimension (the difference is within 0.5 dB). In contrast to the polar lattice and LDA lattice [18], [19], analytic results of the LDLC [20] are not available; therefore, they are less understood in theory. The LDA lattice has slightly better performance than the polar lattice at the expense of higher decoding complexity ($O(p^2 N \log N)$) if p -ary LDPC codes are employed. Assuming $p \approx 2^r$, it would require complexity $O(2^{2r} N \log N)$.

B. Design Examples With Power Constraint

To satisfy the power constraint, we use discrete lattice distribution $D_{\mathbb{Z}, \sigma_s}$ for shaping. The mutual information $I(Y; X_\ell | X_{1:\ell-1})$ at each level for different SNRs is shown in Fig. 14. We can see that for partition $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}/\dots$, five levels are enough to achieve the AWGN channel capacity for SNR ranging from -5 dB to 20 dB. Note that this is more than the number of levels required in the design of the AWGN-good lattice itself.




Fig. 14. Channel capacity for each level as a function of SNR.

For each level, we estimate a lower bound on the code rate for block error probability $P_{B_\ell} = 1 \times 10^{-5}$. The is done by calculating an upper bound on the block error probability of the polar code, using the Bhattacharyya

⁷SER is defined as the average error probability of the coordinates of the lattice codeword λ , which is commonly used in literature. The curve for the LDPC lattice was plotted with the normalized block error probability [17].

parameter. With this target error probability, the assignments of bits to the information, shaping and frozen sets on different levels are shown in Fig. 15 for $\text{SNR} = 15$ dB and $N = 2^{16}$. In fact, X_1 and X_2 are nearly uniform such that there is no need for shaping on the first two levels (these levels actually correspond to the AWGN-good lattice). The third level is very good, and most bits are information bits. In contrast, the fifth level is mostly for shaping; since its message rate is already small, adding another level clearly would not contribute to the overall rate of the lattice code. Finally, lower bounds on the rates achieved by polar lattices with various block lengths are shown in Fig. 16. We note that the gap to the channel capacity diminishes as N increases, and it is only about 0.1 bits/dimension when $N = 2^{20}$.




Fig. 15. The proportions of the shaping set, information set, and frozen set on each level when $N = 2^{16}$ and $\text{SNR} = 15$ dB.




Fig. 16. Lower bounds on the rates achieved by polar lattices with block error probability 5×10^{-5} for block lengths $2^{10}, 2^{12}, \dots, 2^{20}$.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Proof: By the definition of the flatness factor, we have

$$f_{\tilde{\sigma}, \Lambda}(x) \leq \frac{1 + \epsilon_{\Lambda}(\tilde{\sigma})}{V(\Lambda)}.$$

Thus, the differential entropy of the mod- Λ Gaussian noise is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} h(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2) &= - \int_{\mathcal{V}(\Lambda_1)} f_{\tilde{\sigma}, \Lambda}(x) \log f_{\tilde{\sigma}, \Lambda}(x) dx \\ &\geq - \int_{\mathcal{V}(\Lambda_1)} f_{\tilde{\sigma}, \Lambda}(x) \log \frac{1 + \epsilon_{\Lambda}(\tilde{\sigma})}{V(\Lambda)} dx \\ &= - \log \frac{1 + \epsilon_{\Lambda}(\tilde{\sigma})}{V(\Lambda)} \\ &= \log V(\Lambda) - \log(1 + \epsilon_{\Lambda}(\tilde{\sigma})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (5), $C(\Lambda, \tilde{\sigma}^2)$ is bounded by $\log(1 + \epsilon_{\Lambda}(\tilde{\sigma}))$. The second inequality in (12) follows from the fact $\log(1 + x) = \log_2(e) \cdot \log_e(1 + x) \leq \log(e) \cdot x$ for $x > 0$. $\square$

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF LEMMA 2

Proof: For this purpose, we assume $\Lambda = a\mathbb{Z}^n$ where a is determined by the flatness factor condition and $\Lambda' = b\mathbb{Z}^n$ where b is to be estimated. We note that for all partition chains in [21], this is always possible: if the bottom lattice does not take the form of $b\mathbb{Z}^n$, one may simply further extend the partition chain (which will lead to an upper bound on r).

By the union bound, the error probability of Λ' is upper-bounded by

$$P_e(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) \leq nQ\left(\frac{b}{2\tilde{\sigma}}\right) \leq ne^{-\frac{b^2}{8\tilde{\sigma}^2}}$$

where we apply the Chernoff bound on the Q-function. We want

$$P_e(\Lambda', \tilde{\sigma}^2) = e^{-O(N)},$$

which leads to $b = O(\sqrt{N})$. For a binary lattice partition, we have $(b/a)^n = 2^r$. Thus,

$$r = n \log\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) = nO(\log N)$$

if n is fixed. □

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Proof: Since our work only utilizes one-dimensional and two-dimensional lattice partitions, the proof will mainly focus these two cases. We start with the one-dimensional partition $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}/\cdots/2^r\mathbb{Z}$. By scaling the $2^\ell\mathbb{Z}/2^{\ell+1}\mathbb{Z}$ channel by $\frac{1}{2}$, the $2^\ell\mathbb{Z}/2^{\ell+1}\mathbb{Z}$ channel with noise variance σ^2 is stochastically equivalent to the $2^{\ell-1}\mathbb{Z}/2^\ell\mathbb{Z}$ channel with noise variance $\sigma^2/4$. To see this, we use the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ channel and the $2\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ channel as an example. Let W_1 and W_2 represent the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ channel and the $2\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ channel respectively. The input and output of W_1 are $X_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Y_1 \in [-1, 1)$. The input and output of W_2 are $X_2 \in \{0, 2\}$ and $Y_2 \in [-2, 2)$. The transition PDF of the $2\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ channel with σ^2 is given by [21]

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(y_2|x_2, \sigma^2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \sum_{i \in 4\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_2 - i - x_2)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \sum_{i \in 4\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\frac{1}{2}y_2 - \frac{1}{2}i - \frac{1}{2}x_2)^2}{2(\frac{\sigma}{2})^2}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \sum_{i' \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\frac{1}{2}y_2 - i' - \frac{1}{2}x_2)^2}{2(\frac{\sigma}{2})^2}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

The transition PDF of the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ channel with $\sigma^2/4$ is given by

$$W_1(y_1|x_1, \sigma^2/4) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\frac{\sigma}{2})^2}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - i - x_1)^2}{2(\frac{\sigma}{2})^2}\right].$$

Let $X_1 = \frac{X_2}{2}$ and $Y_1 = \frac{Y_2}{2}$, the difference between the transition PDF of the $2\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ channel and the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ channel is the coefficient before the summation, implying that the likelihood ratio of W_2 with σ^2 is equivalent to that of W_1 with $\sigma^2/4$ and hence they are stochastically equivalent.

Therefore, the partition channel at higher level is stochastically equivalent to the partition channel at lower level with smaller noise variance. Since we construct polar codes for each partition channel independently, it is sufficient to prove that $W_1(y_1|x_1, \sigma^2)$ is degraded with respect to $W_1'(y_1'|x_1, \sigma'^2)$ when $\sigma \geq \sigma'$. Note that they both are

mod-2 BAWGN channels with $X \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Y_1, Y'_1 \in [-1, 1)$. Then we have

$$\begin{cases} W_1(y_1|x_1, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - x_1 - i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right], \\ W'_1(y'_1|x_1, \sigma'^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma'^2}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y'_1 - x_1 - i)^2}{2\sigma'^2}\right]. \end{cases}$$

Assume there is an intermediate channel W from Y'_1 to Y_1 such that

$$W(y_1|y'_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - y'_1 - i)^2}{2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}\right].$$

Note that W is a mod- $2\mathbb{Z}$ channel with input $Y'_1 \in [-1, 1)$.

Consider a concatenated channel with W'_1 followed by W , its transition PDF is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-1}^1 W'_1(y'_1|x_1, \sigma'^2) W(y_1|y'_1) dy'_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{i' \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{-1}^1 \exp\left[-\frac{(y'_1 - x_1 - i)^2}{2\sigma'^2}\right] \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - y'_1 - i')^2}{2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}\right] dy'_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{i' \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \int_{-1}^1 \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - x_1 - i - i')^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \exp\left[-\frac{(y'_1 - \frac{(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)x_1 + \sigma'^2 y_1 - \sigma'^2(i+i')}{\sigma^2} - i')^2}{2\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2}\right] dy'_1 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{i+i' \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - x_1 - (i+i'))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \int_{-1}^1 \exp\left[-\frac{(y'_1 - c - i')^2}{2\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2}\right] dy'_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}} \sum_{i+i' \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - x_1 - (i+i'))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y'_1 - c)^2}{2\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2}\right] dy'_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\sigma'^2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}{\sigma^2}} \sum_{i+i' \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - x_1 - (i+i'))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \sum_{i+i' \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - x_1 - (i+i'))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \sum_{i \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_1 - x_1 - i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \\ &= W_1(y_1|x_1, \sigma^2), \end{aligned}$$

where equation (a) holds because of the one-to-one mapping $(i, i') \rightarrow (i, i+i')$ and $c = \frac{(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)x_1 + \sigma'^2 y_1 - \sigma'^2(i+i')}{\sigma^2}$.

Therefore, according to the definition [32, Definition 1.7], the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ channel is degraded with respect to the $2\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ channel, and it can be easily generalized to the conclusion that the $2^{\ell-1}\mathbb{Z}/2^\ell\mathbb{Z}$ channel is degraded with respect to the $2^\ell\mathbb{Z}/2^{\ell+1}\mathbb{Z}$ channel.

For the two-dimensional partition $\mathbb{Z}^2/R\mathbb{Z}^2/2\mathbb{Z}^2/2R\mathbb{Z}^2/4\mathbb{Z}^2$, similarly, the partition channel at level $\ell+1$ with noise variance σ^2 is equivalent to the ℓ -th partition channel with noise variance $\sigma^2/2$. To see this, we use the $\mathbb{Z}^2/R\mathbb{Z}^2$ channel and the $R\mathbb{Z}^2/2\mathbb{Z}^2$ channel as an example. With some abuse of notation, let W_1 and W_2 represent each channel. The input and output of W_1 are given by $\vec{X}_1 \in \{(0,0), (1,0)\}$ and $\vec{Y}_1 \in \mathcal{V}(R\mathbb{Z}^2)$. The input and output of W_2 are given by $\vec{X}_2 \in \{(0,0), (1,1)\}$ and $\vec{Y}_2 \in \mathcal{V}(2\mathbb{Z}^2)$. By scaling W_1 with $R = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, $\vec{X}_1$ and $\vec{Y}_1$

are mapped to $\vec{X}_2$ and $\vec{Y}_2$ respectively, and the two-dimensional Gaussian noise vector (n_1, n_2) in W_1 becomes $(n_1 + n_2, n_1 - n_2)$. Since n_1 is independent of n_2 , then $n_1 + n_2$ is independent of $n_1 - n_2$ as well, and the noise variance increases by 2 in each dimension. Therefore, the partition channel W_2 with noise variance σ^2 is equivalent to W_1 with noise variance $\sigma^2/2$.

Again, it is sufficient to prove that $W_1(\vec{y}_1|\vec{x}_1, \sigma^2)$ is degraded with respect to $W_1'(\vec{y}_1'|\vec{x}_1, \sigma'^2)$ when $\sigma \geq \sigma'$. Let $\vec{X}_1$ and $\vec{Y}_1$ be denoted by (X_a, X_b) and (Y_a, Y_b) (the same holds for $\vec{Y}_1'$), respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{cases} W_1(\vec{y}_1|\vec{x}_1, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_a - x_a - i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] \exp\left[-\frac{(y_b - x_b - j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right], \\ W_1'(\vec{y}_1'|\vec{x}_1, \sigma'^2) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma'^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y'_a - x_a - i)^2}{2\sigma'^2}\right] \exp\left[-\frac{(y'_b - x_b - j)^2}{2\sigma'^2}\right], \end{cases}$$

Assume there is an intermediate channel W from $\vec{Y}_1'$ to $\vec{Y}_1$ such that

$$W(\vec{y}_1|\vec{y}_1') = \frac{1}{2\pi(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_a - y'_a - i)^2}{2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}\right] \exp\left[-\frac{(y_b - y'_b - j)^2}{2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}\right].$$

Note that W is a mod- $R\mathbb{Z}^2$ channel with input $Y_1' \in \mathcal{V}(R\mathbb{Z}^2)$.

Similarly, consider a concatenated channel with W'_1 followed by W , its transition PDF is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{V}(R\mathbb{Z}^2)} W'_1(\vec{y}'_1 | \vec{x}_1, \sigma'^2) W(\vec{y}_1 | \vec{y}'_1) d\vec{y}'_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 \sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{\substack{i',j' \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i'+j' \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \int_{\mathcal{V}(R\mathbb{Z}^2)} \exp \left[-\frac{(y'_a - x_a - i)^2}{2\sigma'^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y_a - y'_a - i')^2}{2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{(y'_b - x_b - j)^2}{2\sigma'^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y_b - y'_b - j')^2}{2(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \right] d\vec{y}'_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 \sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{\substack{i',j' \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i'+j' \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \int_{\mathcal{V}(R\mathbb{Z}^2)} \exp \left[-\frac{(y_a - x_a - i - i')^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y'_a - c_a - i)^2}{2\sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{(y_b - x_b - j - j')^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y'_b - c_b - j)^2}{2\sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2} \right] d\vec{y}'_1 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 \sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{\substack{i+i', j+j' \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+i'+j+j' \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \int_{\mathcal{V}(R\mathbb{Z}^2)} \exp \left[-\frac{(y_a - x_a - i - i')^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y_b - x_b - j - j')^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{(y'_a - c_a - i)^2}{2\sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y'_b - c_b - j)^2}{2\sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2} \right] d\vec{y}'_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 \sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \sum_{\substack{i+i', j+j' \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+i'+j+j' \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \exp \left[-\frac{(y_a - x_a - (i + i'))^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y_b - x_b - (j + j'))^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \exp \left[-\frac{\|\vec{y}'_1 - \vec{c}\|^2}{2\sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)/\sigma^2} \right] d\vec{y}'_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 \sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)} \frac{2\pi \sigma'^2 (\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)}{\sigma^2} \sum_{\substack{i+i', j+j' \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+i'+j+j' \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \exp \left[-\frac{(y_a - x_a - (i + i'))^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y_b - x_b - (j + j'))^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi \sigma^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathbb{Z} \\ i+j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \exp \left[-\frac{(y_a - x_a - i)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \exp \left[-\frac{(y_b - x_b - j)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \\
&= W_1(\vec{y}_1 | \vec{x}_1, \sigma^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where equation (a) holds because of the one-to-one mapping $(i, i', j, j') \rightarrow (i, i + i', j, j + j')$ and $\vec{c} = (c_a, c_b) = (\frac{(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)x_a + \sigma'^2 y_a - \sigma'^2(i + i')}{\sigma^2}, \frac{(\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2)x_b + \sigma'^2 y_b - \sigma'^2(j + j')}{\sigma^2})$. Therefore, the $\mathbb{Z}^2/R\mathbb{Z}^2$ channel is degraded with respect to the $R\mathbb{Z}^2/2\mathbb{Z}^2$ channel

The same technique can be generalized to higher dimensional partitions. By self-similarity, we can always scale the $\Lambda_\ell/\Lambda_{\ell+1}$ channel with noise variance σ^2 to a $\Lambda_{\ell+1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel with noise variance σ'^2 ($\sigma'^2 < \sigma^2$). Then we can define an intermediate channel with input in $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda_\ell)$ and a mod- Λ_ℓ operation at the receiver's front end. The noise variance of this intermediate channel is given by $\sigma^2 - \sigma'^2$. Finally, we can show that the concatenated channel consists of an equivalently scaled $\Lambda_\ell/\Lambda_{\ell+1}$ channel followed by the mentioned intermediate channel is stochastically equivalent to the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel. By definition 2, the $\Lambda_{\ell-1}/\Lambda_\ell$ channel is degraded with respect to the $\Lambda_\ell/\Lambda_{\ell+1}$ channel. $\square$

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF LEMMA 5

Proof: For convenience we consider a one-dimensional partition chain $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}/\dots$. The proof can be extended to the multi-dimensional case by sandwiching the partition in $\mathbb{Z}^n/2\mathbb{Z}^n/\dots$, which reduces to the one-dimensional case.

For level r , the selected coset $\mathcal{A}_r$ can be written as $x_1 + \dots \cdot 2^{r-1}x_r + 2^r\mathbb{Z}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{A}_r$ is a subset of $\mathcal{A}_{r-1}$. Let λ_1 and λ_2 denote the two lattice points with smallest norm in set $\mathcal{A}_{r-1}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\lambda_1 \leq 0 \leq \lambda_2$ and $|\lambda_1| \leq |\lambda_2|$. Observe that $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 = 2^{r-1}$. For a Gaussian distribution with variance σ_s^2 , we can find a positive integer T , making the probability

$$\int_{-T\sigma_s}^{T\sigma_s} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_s} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right) dx \rightarrow 1.$$

Actually, this T does not need to be very large. For instance, when $T = 6$, the above probability is larger than $1 - 2e^{-9}$. Now we assume $2^{r-1} = 3T\sigma_s$, and $T = \delta N$ for some constant δ , then λ_1 and λ_2 cannot be in the interval $[-T\sigma_s, T\sigma_s]$ simultaneously. If the two points are both outside of $[-T\sigma_s, T\sigma_s]$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{A}_{r-1}) &= \frac{f_{\sigma_s}(\mathcal{A}_{r-1}(x_{1:r-1}))}{f_{\sigma_s}(\mathbb{Z})} < \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_s} \sum_{x \in 2^{r-1}\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x+\lambda_1)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_s}} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{x \in 2^{r-1}\mathbb{Z}_-} \exp\left(-\frac{(x+\lambda_1)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{(2^{r-1})^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)} \leq 2 \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{T^2}{2}\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{9T^2}{2}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_-$ represents all non-positive integers. This means the probability of choosing $\mathcal{A}_{r-1}$ goes to zero when T (or N) is large. Therefore, we have that the point λ_1 is in the interval $[-T\sigma_s, T\sigma_s]$ and λ_2 lies outside. Without loss of generality, we assume that the two cosets corresponding to $x_r = 0$ and $x_r = 1$ are $\lambda_1 + 2^r\mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda_2 + 2^r\mathbb{Z}$, respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P(x_r = 0|x_{1:r-1})}{P(x_r = 1|x_{1:r-1})} &= \frac{\sum_{x \in 2^r\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x+\lambda_1)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)}{\sum_{x \in 2^r\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x+\lambda_2)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)} \\ &\geq \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)}{2 \sum_{x \in 2^r\mathbb{Z}_+} \exp\left(-\frac{(x+\lambda_2)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)} \\ &\geq \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_1^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)}{2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_2^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)} \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2^{2r}}{2\sigma_s^2}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_+$ represents all non-negative integers. Since $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 = 2^{r-1} = 3T\sigma_s$ and $\lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \geq T\sigma_s$, for any $T > 1$,

we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P(x_r = 0|x_{1:r-1})}{P(x_r = 1|x_{1:r-1})} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(\frac{3}{2}T^2\right) (1 - \exp(-18T^2)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \exp\left(\frac{3}{2}T^2\right) = \frac{1}{4} \exp\left(\frac{3}{2}\delta^2 N^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\frac{1}{4} \exp(\frac{3}{2}\delta^2 N^2) = M$, we can get $P(x_r = 0|x_{1:r-1}) \geq \frac{M}{M+1}$ and $P(x_r = 1|x_{1:r-1}) \leq \frac{1}{M+1}$. Then we have,

$$I(Y; X_r | X_{1:r-1}) \leq H(X_r | X_{1:r-1}) \leq h_2\left(\frac{1}{M+1}\right),$$

where $h_2(p) = p \log(\frac{1}{p}) + (1-p) \log(\frac{1}{1-p})$ denotes the binary entropy function. By the relationship $\ln(x) \leq \frac{x-1}{\sqrt{x}}$ when $x \geq 1$, we finally have

$$I(Y; X_r | X_{1:r-1}) \leq \log(e) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} + \frac{1}{M} \right) = \log(e) \left(\frac{2}{\exp(\delta_1 2^{2r})} + \frac{4}{\exp(\delta_2 2^{2r})} \right),$$

where δ_1 and δ_2 are two positive constants. Therefore, when $r = O(\log \log N)$, we have $I(Y; X_r | X_{1:r-1}) \rightarrow 0$, and $\sum_{\ell \geq r} I(Y; X_\ell | X_{1:\ell-1}) \leq O(\frac{1}{N})$. $\square$

APPENDIX E

PROOF OF THEOREM 5

Proof: Let $\mathcal{E}_i$ denote the set of pairs of $u^{1:N}$ and $y^{1:N}$ such that decoding error occurs at the i -th bit, then the block decoding error event is given by $\mathcal{E} \equiv \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{E}_i$. According to our encoding scheme, each codeword $u^{1:N}$ appears with probability

$$2^{-(|\mathcal{I}|+|\mathcal{F}|)} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}} P_{U^i | U^{1:i-1}}(u^i | u^{1:i-1}).$$

Then the expectation of decoding error probability over all random mapping is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} E[P_e] &= \sum_{u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} 2^{-(|\mathcal{I}|+|\mathcal{F}|)} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}} P_{U^i | U^{1:i-1}}(u^i | u^{1:i-1}) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot P_{Y^{1:N} | U^{1:N}}(y^{1:N} | u^{1:N}) \mathbf{1}[(u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}) \in \mathcal{E}]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we define the probability distribution $Q_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}$ as

$$Q_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}) = 2^{-(|\mathcal{I}|+|\mathcal{F}|)} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}} P_{U^i | U^{1:i-1}}(u^i | u^{1:i-1}) \right) P_{Y^{1:N} | U^{1:N}}(y^{1:N} | u^{1:N}).$$

Then the variational distance between $Q_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}$ and $P_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}$ can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
2\|Q_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| &= \sum_{u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}) - P(u^{1:N}, y^{1:N})| \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} \left| \sum_i (Q(u^i | u^{1:i-1}) - P(u^i | u^{1:i-1})) \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} P(u^j | u^{1:j-1}) \right) \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^N Q(u^j | u^{1:j-1}) \right) Q(y^{1:N} | u^{1:N}) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{F}} \sum_{u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(u^i | u^{1:i-1}) - P(u^i | u^{1:i-1})| \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} P(u^j | u^{1:j-1}) \right) \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^N Q(u^j | u^{1:j-1}) \right) Q(y^{1:N} | u^{1:N}) \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{F}} \sum_{u^{1:i-1}} 2P(u^{1:i-1}) \|Q_{U^i | U^{1:i-1} = u^{1:i-1}} - P_{U^i | U^{1:i-1} = u^{1:i-1}}\| \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{F}} \sum_{u^{1:i-1}} P(u^{1:i-1}) \sqrt{2 \ln 2 D(P_{U^i | U^{1:i-1} = u^{1:i-1}} \| Q_{U^i | U^{1:i-1} = u^{1:i-1}})} \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{2 \ln 2 \sum_{u^{1:i-1}} P(u^{1:i-1}) D(P_{U^i | U^{1:i-1} = u^{1:i-1}} \| Q_{U^i | U^{1:i-1} = u^{1:i-1}})} \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{2 \ln 2 D(P_{U^i | U^{1:i-1}} \| Q_{U^i | U^{1:i-1}})} \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sqrt{2 \ln 2 (1 - H(U^i | U^{1:i-1}))} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{2 \ln 2 (1 - H(U^i | U^{1:i-1}))} \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sqrt{2 \ln 2 (1 - Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1})^2)} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{2 \ln 2 (1 - Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N})^2)} \\
&\leq 2N \sqrt{4 \ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}},
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where equality (a) follows from [6, Equation (56)] and $Q(y^{1:N} | u^{1:N}) = P(y^{1:N} | u^{1:N})$. $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$ in the inequality (b) is the relative entropy, and this inequality holds because of the Pinsker's inequality. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E[P_e] &= Q_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(\mathcal{E}) \\
&\leq \|Q_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| + P_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(\mathcal{E}) \\
&\leq \|Q_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} P_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(\mathcal{E}_i),
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{U^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(\mathcal{E}_i) &\leq \sum_{u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} P(u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N}) P(u^i | u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N}) \cdot \mathbf{1}[P(u^i | u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N}) \leq P(u^i \oplus 1 | u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N})] \\
&\leq \sum_{u^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} P(u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N}) P(u^i | u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N}) \sqrt{\frac{P(u^i \oplus 1 | u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N})}{P(u^i | u^{1:i-1}, y^{1:N})}} \\
&= Z(U^i | U^{1:i-1}, Y^{1:N}) \leq 2^{-N^\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (32) and (33), we have $E[P_e] \leq 2N \sqrt{4 \ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}} + N 2^{-N^\beta} = N 2^{-N^{\beta'}}$ for any $\beta' < \beta < 0.5$. $\square$

APPENDIX F

PROOF OF THEOREM 6

Proof: Let $\mathcal{E}_i$ denote the set of triples of $u_2^{1:N}$, $x_1^{1:N}$ and $y^{1:N}$ such that decoding error occurs at the i -th bit, then the block decoding error event is given by $\mathcal{E} \equiv \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{E}_i$. According to our encoding scheme, each codeword $u_2^{1:N}$ appears with probability

$$2^{-(|\mathcal{I}_2|+|\mathcal{F}_2|)} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}_2} P_{U_2^i | U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}}(u_2^i | u_2^{1:i-1}, x_1^{1:N}).$$

Then the expectation of decoding error probability over all random mapping is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} E[P_e] = & \sum_{u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} 2^{-(|\mathcal{I}_2|+|\mathcal{F}_2|)} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}_2} P_{U_2^i | U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}}(u_2^i | u_2^{1:i-1}, x_1^{1:N}) \right) \\ & \cdot P_{Y^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N} | U_2^{1:N}}(y^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}) \mathbb{1}[(u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}) \in \mathcal{E}]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we define the probability distribution $Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}) = & 2^{-(|\mathcal{I}_2|+|\mathcal{F}_2|)} \cdot Q_{X_1^{1:N}}(x_1^{1:N}) \\ & \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}_2} P_{U_2^i | U_2^{1:i-1}, X_1^{1:N}}(u_2^i | u_2^{1:i-1}, x_1^{1:N}) \right) \cdot P_{Y^{1:N} | X_1^{1:N}, U_2^{1:N}}(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the variational distance between $Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}$ and $P_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}$ can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} 2\|Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| &= \sum_{u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}) - P(u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N})| \\ &= \sum_{u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N}) Q(x_1^{1:N}) Q(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}) - P(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N}) P(x_1^{1:N}) P(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N})| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N}) - P(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N})| P(x_1^{1:N}) P(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}) \\ &+ \sum_{u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(x_1^{1:N}) - P(x_1^{1:N})| Q(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N}) P(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}) \end{aligned}$$

where inequation (a) follows from [6, Equation (56)], $Q(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}) = P(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N})$. For the first summation, following the same fashion as the proof of Theorem 5, we can prove

$$\sum_{u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N}) - P(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N})| P(x_1^{1:N}) P(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}) \leq 2N \sqrt{4 \ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}}.$$

According to the result of the coding scheme for level 1, we already have

$$2\|Q_{U_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| \leq 2N \sqrt{4 \ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}}. \quad (34)$$

Since we have $P_{Y^{1:N} | U_1^{1:N}} = Q_{Y^{1:N} | U_1^{1:N}}$, we can write

$$2\|Q_{U_1^{1:N}} - P_{U_1^{1:N}}\| \leq 2N \sqrt{4 \ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}}. \quad (35)$$

Clearly, there is a one to one mapping between $U_1^{1:N}$ and $X_1^{1:N}$, then we immediately have $2\|Q_{X_1^{1:N}} - P_{X_1^{1:N}}\| \leq 2N\sqrt{4\ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}}$. Therefore, for the second summation,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}, y^{1:N}} |Q(x_1^{1:N}) - P(x_1^{1:N})| Q(u_2^{1:N} | x_1^{1:N}) P(y^{1:N} | u_2^{1:N}, x_1^{1:N}) \\ = \sum_{x_1^{1:N}} |Q(x_1^{1:N}) - P(x_1^{1:N})| \leq 2N\sqrt{4\ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Then we have $\|Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| \leq 4N\sqrt{4\ln 2 \cdot 2^{-N^\beta}}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} E[P_e] &= Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(\mathcal{E}) \\ &\leq \|Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| + P_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(\mathcal{E}) \\ &\leq \|Q_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}} - P_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}\| + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} P_{U_2^{1:N}, X_1^{1:N}, Y^{1:N}}(\mathcal{E}_i), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

The rest part of the proof follows the same fashion of the proof of Theorem 5. Finally we have $E[P_e] \leq N2^{-N^{\beta'}}$ for any $\beta' < \beta < 0.5$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Arkan, "Channel polarization: A method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051–3073, July 2009.
- [2] E. Şaşıoğlu, E. Telatar, and E. Arkan, "Polarization for arbitrary discrete memoryless channels," in *IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Oct. 2009, pp. 144–148.
- [3] A. Sahebi and S. Pradhan, "Multilevel channel polarization for arbitrary discrete memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 7839–7857, Dec. 2013.
- [4] W. Park and A. Barg, "Polar codes for q -ary channels, $q = 2^r$," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 955–969, Feb. 2013.
- [5] R. Mori and T. Tanaka, "Non-binary polar codes using Reed-Solomon codes and algebraic geometry codes," in *IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Aug. 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [6] J. Honda and H. Yamamoto, "Polar coding without alphabet extension for asymmetric models," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 7829–7838, Dec. 2013.
- [7] M. Mondelli, S. H. Hassani, and R. L. Urbanke, "How to achieve the capacity of asymmetric channels," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1406.7373, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.7373>
- [8] E. Abbe and E. Telatar, "Polar codes for the m-user multiple access channel," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 5437–5448, Aug. 2012.
- [9] E. Abbe and A. Barron, "Polar coding schemes for the AWGN channel," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, July 2011, pp. 194–198.
- [10] U. Erez and R. Zamir, "Achieving $1/2 \log(1+\text{SNR})$ on the AWGN channel with lattice encoding and decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 2293–2314, Oct. 2004.
- [11] C. Ling and J.-C. Belfiore, "Achieving AWGN channel capacity with lattice Gaussian coding," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5918–5929, Oct. 2014.
- [12] C. Ling, L. Luzzi, J.-C. Belfiore, and D. Stehlé, "Semantically secure lattice codes for the Gaussian wiretap channel," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 6399–6416, Oct. 2014.
- [13] B. Nazer and M. Gastpar, "Compute-and-forward: Harnessing interference through structured codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6463–6486, Oct. 2011.
- [14] R. Zamir, S. Shamai, and U. Erez, "Nested linear/lattice codes for structured multiterminal binning," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1250–1276, June 2002.
- [15] R. Zamir, *Lattice Coding for Signals and Networks*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- [16] G. Poltyrev, "On coding without restrictions for the AWGN channel," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 40, pp. 409–417, Mar. 1994.
- [17] M.-R. Sadeghi, A. Banihashemi, and D. Panario, "Low-density parity-check lattices: Construction and decoding analysis," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4481–4495, Oct. 2006.
- [18] N. Di Pietro, J. J. Boutros, G. Zémor, and L. Brunel, "Integer low-density lattices based on Construction A," in *IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Sept. 2012, pp. 422–426.
- [19] N. di Pietro, G. Zémor, and J. J. Boutros, "New results on Construction A lattices based on very sparse parity-check matrices," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, July 2013, pp. 1675–1679.
- [20] N. Sommer, M. Feder, and O. Shalvi, "Low-density lattice codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 1561–1585, Apr. 2008.
- [21] G. D. Forney Jr., M. Trott, and S.-Y. Chung, "Sphere-bound-achieving coset codes and multilevel coset codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 820–850, May 2000.
- [22] D. Micciancio and O. Regev, "Worst-case to average-case reductions based on Gaussian measures," in *Proc. Ann. Symp. Found. Computer Science*, Oct. 2004, pp. 372–381.
- [23] Y. Yan and C. Ling, "A construction of lattices from polar codes," in *IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Sept. 2012, pp. 124–128.
- [24] Y. Yan, C. Ling, and X. Wu, "Polar lattices: Where Arkan meets Forney," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, 2013, pp. 1292–1296.
- [25] M. Seidl, A. Schenk, C. Stierstorfer, and J. B. Huber, "Multilevel polar-coded modulation," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 4108–4119, Oct. 2013.
- [26] U. Wachsmann, R. Fischer, and J. Huber, "Multilevel codes: Theoretical concepts and practical design rules," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 1361–1391, July 1999.
- [27] A. Joseph and A. Barron, "Least squares superposition codes of moderate dictionary size are reliable at rates up to capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 2541–2557, May 2012.
- [28] —, "Fast sparse superposition codes have exponentially small error probability for $R < C$," 2012. [Online]. Available: <http://arXiv:1207.2406>
- [29] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere Packings, Lattices, and Groups*, Second Edition, 1993, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [30] W. Kositsattanakarn and F. Oggier, "On Construction D and related constructions of lattices from linear codes," in *Int. Workshop on Coding and Cryptography (WCC)*, 2013.
- [31] G. D. Forney Jr., "Coset codes-Part I: Introduction and geometrical classification," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 1123–1151, Sept. 1988.
- [32] S. B. Korada, "Polar codes for channel and source coding," Ph.D. dissertation, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, 2009.
- [33] E. Arkan and E. Telatar, "On the rate of channel polarization," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, July 2009, pp. 1493–1495.
- [34] I. Tal and A. Vardy, "How to construct polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 6562–6582, Oct. 2013.
- [35] R. Pedarsani, S. Hassani, I. Tal, and E. Telatar, "On the construction of polar codes," in *Proc. 2011 IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT 2011)*, 2011, pp. 11–15.
- [36] S. H. Hassani, K. Alishahi, and R. Urbanke, "Finite-length scaling for polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5875–5898, Oct. 2014.
- [37] V. Guruswami and P. Xia, "Polar codes: Speed of polarization and polynomial gap to capacity," in *IEEE 54th Annual Symp. Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, Oct. 2013, pp. 310–319.
- [38] D. Goldin and D. Burshtein, "Improved bounds on the finite length scaling of polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, Sept. 2014.
- [39] A. Ingber, R. Zamir, and M. Feder, "Finite dimensional infinite constellations," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1630–1656, Mar. 2013.
- [40] E. Arkan, "Source polarization," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, 2010, pp. 899–903.
- [41] R. Mori and T. Tanaka, "Performance of polar codes with the construction using density evolution," *IEEE Comm. Lett.*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 519–521, July 2009.